GAO/RCED-88-104

United States General Accounting Office

GAO

Report to the Chairman, Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives

June 1988

OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS

COMPLETED 90

Environmental Studies Program Meets Most User Needs but Changes Needed

GAO

United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

Resources, Community, and
Economic Development Division

B-207556

June 29, 1988

The Honorable Mike Synar
Chairman, Environment, Energy, and
Natural Resources Subcommittee
Committee on Government Operations
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This report, prepared at your request, discusses the Department of the Interior's outer continental shelf environmental studies program. It addresses program user satisfaction, the timeliness and usefulness of program studies, and the efficiency of the Alaska program.

As arranged with your office, unless you publicly announce its contents earlier, we plan no further distribution of this report until 30 days from the date of this letter. At that time we will send copies to the Director, Office of Management and Budget; the Secretary of the Interior; the Secretary of Commerce; other House and Senate committees and subcommittees having oversight and appropriation responsibilities for the offshore leasing and development program; and other interested parties.

This work was performed under the direction of James Duffus III, Associate Director. Other major contributors are listed in appendix VI.

Sincerely yours,

J. Dexter Peach

J. Dexter Peach
Assistant Comptroller General

Executive Summary

Purpose

About $450 million has been spent since 1973 to produce environmental studies of the outer continental shelf (OCS) in support of the Department of the Interior's oil and gas lease sale decisions. Some states, public interest groups, and one federal agency have raised concerns about the program, particularly the usefulness and quality of the studies.

At the request of the Chairman, Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources Subcommittee, House Committee on Government Operations, GAO

- determined whether delivery of environmental studies was timely in relation to originally scheduled due dates and planned lease uses,
- identified the level of user satisfaction with environmental studies and how Interior's Minerals Management Service (MMS) used these studies for OCS decision-making, and
- determined whether the Alaska program resources could be used more efficiently.

Background

Interior established the environmental studies program in 1973 to support its offshore oil and gas leasing program. The studies program collects information to assess and manage the impacts of oil and gas activities on the human, marine, and coastal environments. MMS uses the studies in both pre- and postlease sale decision documents, including environmental impact statements, and to evaluate companies' oil and gas exploration and production plans. Coastal states and committees that advise the environmental studies program use the studies for several purposes, including providing input to MMS during the presale planning process.

MMS provides day-to-day management of the studies program and procures studies from both private sector contractors and other government agencies. Through an annual agreement, MMS provides funding to the Department of Commerce's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to administer a portion of the Alaska studies program. NOAA's responsibilities include awarding and administering some environmental studies contracts and providing ship support. Alaska studies have received about half of the total program funding since fiscal year 1973.

Results in Brief

Although GAO found that MMS and NOAA received most draft and final studies after their originally scheduled due dates, MMS identified only

seven instances in which studies were not received in time for planned lease sale uses and MMS said there was little or no effect from not receiving these studies in time. In general, both MMS and non-MMS users of program studies were satisfied with the usefulness, timeliness, and quality of the program studies. Certain groups, however, believed that about half the studies were received too late to be used in providing input to MMS on lease sale decisions. (See ch. 2.)

Recent declines in the Alaska program funding and the number of studies contracts, coupled with duplication of program administrative functions by MMS and NOAA, have reduced program efficiency. While NOAA and MMS both manage contracts, reductions in funding over the last several years have made this arrangement less efficient as evidenced by an increasing percentage of NOAA's funds being consumed by administrative functions. Consolidating the Alaska program's administrative functions could save up to $1.3 million per year. (See ch. 3.)

Principal Findings

Receipt of Program Studies

MMS regulations require that information collected by the studies program, to the extent practicable, be provided in time to be used for leasing decisions or other management responsibilities. GAO reviewed all 197 studies program contracts awarded during fiscal years 1983 to 1985 and found that most draft and final studies were submitted to MMS and NOAA after their originally scheduled due dates. Draft studies were submitted on average about 5.6 months after original due dates and final studies about 8.3 months after original due dates. MMS and NOAA attributed this to, among other things, poor contractor performance, adverse weather and sea conditions, and MMS' and NOAA's tasking contractors to collect more data.

Despite these overruns, MMS identified only seven instances in which study products were not received in time for their planned lease sale uses. According to MMS, in five cases late studies caused increased uncertainty in conclusions and recommendations in sale decision documents and, in two of these five cases, MMS placed restrictions on the lease sale allowing it to use the study results when available. However, MMS said that the effects were either insignificant or later mitigated by circumstances such as a lease sale cancellation. MMS indicated no adverse

impact from the remaining two studies that were not available for their planned lease sale uses.

User Satisfaction With Environmental Studies Program

GAO surveyed MMS headquarters and regional officials, members of the OCS Policy and Scientific Advisory committees, governors of coastal states, members of regional technical working groups, and a random sample of individuals and organizations (including some from local governments) included on MMS' distribution lists to determine user satisfaction with the studies program. In general, each of these groups was satisfied with the usefulness and quality of program studies. Most of the groups said that the majority of the studies were received in time for their use in providing input to MMS in lease sale decisions.

Members of the Policy Committee, coastal states, and local government respondents, however, disagreed with the majority regarding the timeliness of program studies. Many of these respondents said they received half of the program studies too late to use in providing input to MMS on lease sale decisions. Further, Scientific Committee respondents believed that MMS did not need about 30 percent of the studies for leasing decisions. And some groups disagreed about what the program's future emphasis should be.

Use of Alaska Studies Program Staff

The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1978 (P.L. 95-372) require that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the responsibilities of the environmental studies program, use the capabilities of the Department of Commerce. In three OCS regions, MMS uses NOAA to perform research for the environmental studies program. In the Alaska region, however, NOAA's primary role has been one of program management—evolving from managing most of the contracts awarded in the program's early years to managing only specific studies as directed by MMS in recent years. Conversely, Interior's role in Alaska has changed from primarily oversight of NOAA activities to actively managing about half of the ongoing contracts. In their managerial roles, both agencies perform similar functions of awarding and administering contracts.

In recent years, Alaska studies program funding has declined from a high of $29.1 million in fiscal year 1976 to an estimated $7.3 million in fiscal year 1988. The decline in program funding is reflected in a declining number of studies contracts. The sharpest decline has been in the

number of contracts managed by NOAA—from 169 in fiscal year 1976 to 35 in fiscal year 1987.

NOAA management costs as a percentage of total costs reimbursed by MMS have increased from 17.0 percent in fiscal year 1983 to an estimated 35.2 percent in fiscal year 1988. NOAA and MMS program funding, contracts awarded, and contracts managed decreased from fiscal year 1983 to fiscal year 1987, while program staff in both agencies remained relatively constant. MMS believes it may have to reassign staff if these declines continue, while NOAA believes its staff cannot be further reduced without adversely affecting its expertise and responsiveness to MMS.

On the basis of cost data provided by MMS, GAO estimates that up to $1.3 million per year could be saved by consolidating NOAA's and MMS' administrative functions related to the Alaska program in MMS. While consolidation would result in increased efficiency, issues such as staffing, public perception of objectivity, and scientific expertise also need to be considered.

Recommendation

GAO recommends that the Secretary of the Interior direct the Director of MMS to develop alternatives for making more efficient the environmental studies program contract award and administration functions currently carried out by both NOAA and MMS. In deciding which alternative to pursue, MMS should consider not only potential dollar savings but also other issues such as staffing, public perception of objectivity, and continuity of scientific expertise.

Agency Comments

GAO discussed the results of its review with MMS and NOAA officials and, in general, they agreed with GAO's findings. Their comments are included where appropriate. As requested, GAO did not obtain official agency comments on a draft of this report.

Contents

Executive Summary		2
Chapter 1 Introduction		8
	Legislative Requirements for OCS Environmental Studies	9
	Organization and Administration of the Environmental Studies Program	10
	Objectives, Scope, and Methodology	12
Chapter 2 Program Studies Miss Original Due Dates but Are Considered Timely, Useful, and of High Quality		14
	MMS and Non-MMS Use of Program Studies	14
	Most Draft and Final Studies Received After Original Due Dates	15
	Most MMS Officials Believed Program Studies Were Useful, Timely, of High Quality, and Needed	17
	Views of States and Others About the Program	19
	Views of States and Others on Past and Future Emphasis of the Program	21
	Conclusions	23
Chapter 3 Consolidating Alaska Program Management Functions Can Increase Efficiency		25
	Historical Roles of MMS and NOAA in the Alaska Program	25
	The Administrative Functions of MMS and NOAA Largely Duplicate Each Other	26
	Funds for the Alaska Program Have Been Declining	27
	Duplicative Administrative Functions Have Become Less Efficient	30
	Consolidating Administrative Functions Can Increase Efficiency	31
	Other Issues to Be Considered in Any Decision to Consolidate	33
	Conclusions	34
	Recommendation	34
Appendixes		
	Appendix I: Objectives, Scope, and Methodology	36
	Appendix II: MMS and NOAA Officials' Responses to Our Questionnaire	43
	Appendix III: Coastal States' Responses to Our Questionnaire	49
	Appendix IV: OCS Advisory Board Members' Responses to Our Questionnaire	62

Appendix V: Random Sample Responses to Our Questionnaire 75
Appendix VI: Major Contributors to This Report 88

Tables

Table 2.1: Most Frequent MMS Uses of Program Studies 15
Table 2.2: Summary of MMS Survey Results on Usefulness, Timeliness, Quality, and Need for Program Studies 18
Table 2.3: Summary of Questionnaire Responses From Coastal States, MMS Committees, and Other Groups About Program Studies 19
Table 2.4: Policy Committee, Scientific Committee, and Local Government Rankings on Future Emphasis of Program Research Topics 22
Table 2.5: Policy Committee and Local Government Rankings on Future Emphasis of Factors That Produce Environmental Impacts 23
Table 3.1: Budget for Alaska Region Environmental Studies Program—Fiscal Years 1974-88 28
Table 3.2: Alaska Program Contracts Awarded by MMS and NOAA—Fiscal Years 1974-87 29
Table 3.3: Alaska Program Contracts Managed by MMS and NOAA—Fiscal Years 1974-87 29
Table 3.4: NOAA's Alaska Program Management Costs as a Percentage of Costs Reimbursed by MMS—Fiscal Years 1974-88 30
Table 3.5: NOAA and MMS Alaska Program Environmental Studies Funding, Contracts Awarded, Contracts Managed, and Staffing—Fiscal Years 1983 and 1987 31
Table 3.6: Estimated Annual Savings if Administrative Functions Are Consolidated in MMS 32
Table I.1: Response Characteristics of Random Sample Respondents in Survey 39

Abbreviations

BLM	Bureau of Land Management
GAO	General Accounting Office
MMS	Minerals Management Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
OCS	outer continental shelf

Chapter 1

Introduction

The outer continental shelf (OCS) is estimated to contain 30 to 60 percent of the nation's undiscovered oil and gas resources. The first 3 miles offshore belong to adjacent states, while the area from 3 miles to about 200 miles offshore is under federal jurisdiction.[1] The Secretary of the Interior is responsible for leasing the federal areas by granting rights to explore for and develop and produce oil, natural gas, and other minerals on the OCS. The objectives of Interior's OCS leasing program include increasing domestic oil and natural gas production, decreasing U.S. dependence on oil imports, and providing reasonably priced oil and natural gas. Interior is also responsible for protecting the environment.

Interior established the Environmental Studies Program in 1973 to study the environmental impacts of OCS development and provide information to Interior for making decisions about development of OCS mineral resources. The 1953 OCS Lands Act, as amended in 1978, requires Interior to develop information about the OCS environment and consider it in making lease sale decisions.[2] Since the studies program's inception, Interior has spent approximately $450 million on environmental studies of the OCS. Initially, the program consisted primarily of baseline and monitoring studies designed to characterize the OCS environment both before and after oil and gas activities. In 1978 Interior restructured the program to require a clear relationship between a study and OCS issues and decisions.

Program studies are used in both pre- and postlease sale decision documents. Prelease sale uses of studies include helping to select lease sale areas, to prepare environmental impact statements, and to formulate lease sale stipulations.[3] Program studies are also used to assist in predicting oil spill movements and the possible effects on the environment of an oil spill. Postlease uses include providing information for the initial screening of environmental reports submitted by industry in oil and

[1]Two special cases are Texas and the Gulf Coast of Florida, where the first 9 miles are under state jurisdiction.

[2]Regulations implementing the OCS Lands Act, as amended, establish the procedures for conducting OCS oil and gas lease sales. These procedures include identifying the location of potential recoverable oil and gas resources and conducting environmental analyses (i.e., preparing environmental impact statements) for a proposed lease area. Studies program reports are used to prepare environmental impact statements and other documents. Interior makes OCS lease sale decisions on the basis of information contained in environmental impact statements and other sources.

[3]Stipulations are conditions Interior's Minerals Management Service (MMS) imposes on lease sales to monitor and protect the environment prior to or during the exploration and/or production phases of oil and gas development.

gas exploration and development plans[1] and for evaluating lease stipulations.

In 1982 Interior adopted an "area-wide" approach for the leasing of OCS lands, increasing the number and frequency of lease sales and offering more tracts for lease. Interior believed that, among other things, area-wide leasing would increase domestic oil and gas production, decrease dependence on imported oil, and moderate oil and natural gas prices. We reported in 1985 on various public and congressional concerns with the area-wide approach, including concern over potential environmental damage from leasing certain areas.[2] We also reported that some states and others said that draft environmental impact statements frequently were incomplete or inaccurate.

Although Interior revised the environmental studies program to tie it more closely with OCS issues and decisions, states, public interest groups, and the Environmental Protection Agency have raised concerns about the program. Some states are concerned that the studies program has not kept pace with the area-wide leasing schedule, whereas public interest groups as well as some states questioned the usefulness and quality of environmental studies. Environmental Protection Agency officials claimed that the studies program lacked focus and that the quality of some studies may be questionable.

Legislative Requirements for OCS Environmental Studies

The 1953 OCS Lands Act (P.L. 83-212) and its 1978 amendments (P.L. 95-372) established the policies for managing the offshore oil and gas leasing program. The 1953 act established federal jurisdiction over the OCS and authorized Interior to grant leases for the exploration and development of oil, gas, and other minerals of the OCS. The 1978 amendments called for expedited exploration and development of the OCS to achieve national economic and energy goals and required Interior to balance an orderly energy resource development with protection of the human, marine, and coastal environments. The 1978 amendments also required the Secretary of the Interior (1) to conduct environmental studies of areas to be included in lease sales to establish information for assessing

[1]Before oil and gas exploration, development, or production, a lease holder (or its operator) must submit for MMS review and approval a plan for these activities and an environmental report. The report provides information MMS can use to determine the environmental effects of the planned activities. Program studies may be used to review the adequacy of information contained in the industry environmental report.

[2]Early Assessment of Interior's Area-Wide Program for Leasing Offshore Lands (GAO/RCED-85-66, July 15, 1985).

and managing environmental impacts of oil and gas development and (2) to use the Department of Commerce, to the maximum extent practicable, to carry out its responsibilities.

Organization and Administration of the Environmental Studies Program

Interior's regulations require the environmental studies program to collect information to assess and manage environmental impacts of OCS oil and gas development on human, marine, and coastal environments. These regulations also require additional monitoring after the leasing and development of an area or region to identify any significant changes in the quality and productivity of the human, marine, and coastal environments. Such information can then be used to design experiments to identify the causes of such changes and to identify trends.

The Minerals Management Service's branch of environmental studies in Washington, D.C., provides overall management of the studies program. The four MMS OCS regional offices correspond to the four OCS areas—Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, Pacific, and Alaska. Each regional office is responsible for administering the studies program in its region. MMS, through annual agreements with the Department of Commerce's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), uses NOAA's OCS Environmental Assessment Program located in Anchorage to administer a portion of the Alaska program.

The OCS Policy and Scientific Advisory Committees, as well as regional technical working groups,[a] provide advice and guidance to Interior about the leasing and/or studies program. The Policy Committee, comprised of members nominated by the governor of each coastal state, representatives of federal agencies, and others from the public and private sector, is responsible for providing advice on the leasing, exploration, and development of the OCS. The OCS Scientific Advisory Committee, a group of 10 to 15 independent scientists, is responsible for advising the Director of MMS on the feasibility, appropriateness, and scientific value of the studies program. Members are appointed on the basis of such factors as their scientific competence and reputation within their field of expertise.

[a]Regional technical working groups are established in each of the regional offices to provide advice on technical matters of regional concern. Membership is comprised of those individuals nominated by state governors and others nominated by the Secretary of the Interior from the public and private sectors.

Program Funding Levels

Program funding declined from a high of about $55.6 million in fiscal year 1976 to about $22.8 million in fiscal year 1988. According to MMS officials, several factors caused this decline, including reduced industry interest and fewer lease sales resulting from lower oil prices.

The Alaska program has received about half of the total program funding since fiscal year 1973. Alaska has received a large share of the funding, according to MMS officials, to provide needed information about the Alaska environment and to comply with such legislation as the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended; but MMS told us that program emphasis is now shifting to studies in the Pacific and Gulf of Mexico regions where there is significant oil and gas development and oil industry interest. However, according to MMS, any further budget reductions could affect MMS' ability to fund new studies. The inability to fund new studies could, according to the chief of MMS' environmental assessment division, affect environmental research in areas such as offshore Washington and Oregon, where little or no oil and gas development has occurred. He emphasized that information is needed about these areas to predict where possible environmental effects may be experienced if oil and gas development takes place.

Planning and Procurement Processes

MMS identifies environmental studies needs annually, approximately 2 years in advance of when studies are expected to begin. The planning process begins when MMS' environmental studies branch disseminates policy and guidance to MMS regional offices for preparing regional studies plans. Each regional office prepares these plans with the assistance of regional technical working groups and other local advisors.

Because the total cost for studies nominated in the regional studies plans usually exceeds the annual budget for the program, MMS uses ranking criteria to prioritize study needs. Interior and the Office of Management and Budget jointly developed the ranking criteria in 1979. They include such factors as the date of the management decision for which the study is designed and the applicability of the study to issues of regional or national concern. Following preparation of the regional studies plans, the branch of environmental studies prepares the national studies list, which identifies program study needs to be initiated in the next fiscal year, as well as on-going, multiyear studies, which require annual funding approval. Once the national studies list is approved by the Associate Director for Offshore Minerals Management, regional offices develop schedules for procuring studies.

MMS, having no research capabilities of its own, procures its environmental studies from various sources, including private contractors, educational institutions, and other government agencies and bureaus. Contracting officers in MMS' procurement branch in Herndon, Virginia—the office responsible for procuring program studies—make final contract award decisions.[7] NOAA also procures studies for MMS in support of the Alaska program. NOAA's Alaska office prepares an annual technical development plan, which identifies individual studies that NOAA will manage in support of MMS' Alaska OCS region. NOAA staff develop statements of work for each identified study, and NOAA's Western Administrative Support Center in Seattle, Washington—the office responsible for NOAA Alaska procurement—assembles a procurement plan based upon the technical development plan. The procurement plan, among other things, indicates dates by which study contracts must be awarded in order to meet NOAA and MMS time frames. Contracting officers in the Western Administrative Support Center award contracts.

MMS administers program contracts through its contracting officers and the contracting officers' technical representatives located in the four OCS regions and in MMS headquarters. NOAA contract administration functions are conducted by contract specialists located in the Western Administrative Support Center and the contracting officers' technical representatives located in NOAA's office in Anchorage. The technical representatives for both MMS and NOAA are responsible for the day-to-day monitoring of contractor performance, including compliance with contract specifications and verifying satisfactory delivery of studies.

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

In his August 20, 1986, letter, the Chairman, Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources Subcommittee, House Committee on Government Operations, asked us to review certain aspects of the environmental studies program. As agreed with the Chairman's office, we focused on the following three objectives:

- Determine whether delivery of environmental studies was timely in relation to originally scheduled due dates and planned lease uses.
- Identify how MMS used program information for OCS decision-making and determine the level of satisfaction of MMS, states, and others with program studies.

[7]The term "contract" is used to include all contracts and inter-and intra-agency agreements that MMS has entered into to procure environmental studies.

- Determine whether Alaska program resources could be used more efficiently.

Appendix I contains a detailed discussion of our scope and methodology, including details on the questionnaires and data collection instruments we used to obtain information from MMS and non-MMS individuals and organizations about their satisfaction with the program.

Our work was conducted between August 1986 and March 1988 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. We discussed the results of our review with MMS and NOAA officials and have incorporated their comments where appropriate. However, at the Chairman's request, we did not ask either agency for official comments on this report.

Chapter 2

Program Studies Miss Original Due Dates but Are Considered Timely, Useful, and of High Quality

MMS used environmental studies reports in making decisions concerning development of OCS mineral resources. Individuals and organizations outside MMS also used information from the studies for various purposes, including using studies to provide input to decisions on OCS lease sales. Many draft and final environmental studies reports missed their originally scheduled due dates for a variety of reasons—some attributable to the contractors, others to MMS and NOAA, and still others to factors outside the control of either, such as adverse weather and sea conditions. However, except in a small number of cases, MMS received the studies in time to use them. Moreover, MMS and non-MMS users alike generally believed that the studies provided useful, quality information about the OCS environment, although some non-MMS users believed that some of the studies were not timely for their purposes and/or not necessarily needed for MMS decision-making.

Most of those we surveyed thought the studies program had appropriately emphasized research topics and factors that produce environmental impacts associated with oil and gas development on the OCS and agreed on the research topics and factors that should receive the greatest future emphasis. However, some groups disagreed on the topics and factors that should receive the greatest future emphasis.

MMS and Non-MMS Use of Program Studies

MMS used studies produced from the program for a variety of lease sale uses, including preparation of environmental impact statements, secretarial issue documents,[1] and Interior's 5-year leasing schedule.[2] MMS officials told us that MMS used studies from all except 2 of the 106 contracts that we reviewed.[3] One study was not used because the lease sale for which it was to be used was cancelled. The other study was not used because no oil or gas production had occurred in the area covered by the study.

[1]Secretarial issue documents are prepared for each lease sale and analyze issues involved in the proposed sale, such as economic benefits and environmental risks. The document is sent to the Secretary of the Interior for review and consideration of proposed lease sales.

[2]The OCS Lands Act, as amended, and Interior regulations require that OCS lease sales be included in an approved 5-year oil and gas leasing schedule. These schedules, submitted to the President and the Congress, identify those areas for which lease sales are planned over a 5-year period. The most recent 5-year plan (dated April 1987) covers the period of mid-1987 to mid-1992.

[3]We reviewed 106 contracts out of a total of 197 contracts awarded during fiscal years 1983 to 1985. The 106 contracts selected were identified by MMS as being completed or closed as of our cut-off date of December 31, 1986, and/or were determined by us to be those MMS and NOAA contracts that had either received, or appeared to have received, a final study report as of our cut-off date.

The most frequent uses of studies from the contracts that we reviewed, obtained from our survey of MMS headquarters and regional officials, are shown in table 2.1. Studies from program contracts generally have multiple uses.

Table 2.1: Most Frequent MMS Uses of Program Studies

Use	Frequency of use[a]
Prepare draft environmental impact statement	64
Synthesize information[b]	54
Prepare final environmental impact statement	49
Develop or use computer models	38
Develop OCS 5-year leasing schedule	28
Fulfill legal requirements	21
Prepare secretarial issue document	19

[a]Because some products had multiple uses, the frequency of use exceeds the 106 contracts we reviewed.

[b]Synthesis of environmental information includes combining information from several sources into one source.

Coastal states and committees that advise the environmental studies program used program studies for many purposes, although generally not to a great extent for any one purpose. The most extensive uses of the studies were:

- providing input during the MMS presale planning process;
- commenting on Interior's 5-year leasing schedule; and
- updating, assessing, or synthesizing knowledge in a subject area.

In general, other individuals and organizations outside MMS used studies for only a few purposes and not to a great extent for any of these purposes. They used these studies for the following:

- preparing environmental reports for their own or other organizations;
- providing a basis for scientific research; and
- updating, assessing, or synthesizing knowledge in a subject area.

Most Draft and Final Studies Received After Original Due Dates

Most draft and final studies MMS and NOAA received as of December 31, 1986, were received after the due dates specified in the original contracts. As of December 31, 1986, MMS and NOAA received 132 draft studies and 122 final studies from those contracts awarded during fiscal years 1983 to 1985. Of these studies, 110 draft and 101 final studies

missed their original due dates.[1] The overdue draft studies were submitted an average of 5.6 months after the original due dates, and the overdue final studies were submitted an average of 8.3 months after the original due dates. Only 12 draft and 15 final studies were received on or before the original due dates. We also found that 44 draft and 68 final studies were due, but had not yet been submitted to MMS or NOAA, as of December 31, 1986.

MMS and NOAA officials provided us several reasons why draft and final studies were not submitted when originally due, including poor contractor performance, MMS' and NOAA's tasking contractors to collect and analyze additional data beyond the original statement of work, inadequate contractor monitoring by MMS and NOAA staff, and adverse weather and sea conditions.

MMS studies program regulations require that information available or collected by the studies program shall, to the extent practicable, be provided in a form and in a time frame that can be used in the decision-making process for leasing or other management responsibilities. MMS officials told us that they received seven studies too late for a planned lease sale use. In five of these cases, this caused reduced precision and certainty of analysis, conclusions, and recommendations in environmental impact statements and proposed notices of sale. In two of these five cases, MMS placed stipulations on the lease sale, which allowed MMS to use the studies when they became available to develop postlease sale exploration and development requirements. However, MMS officials said the effects in all five of these cases were either insignificant or mitigated because of other circumstances, such as the cancellation of the lease sale. In the other two of the seven cases, MMS indicated no adverse impacts from the studies not being available.

[1]MMS and NOAA received 10 draft and 6 final studies for which due dates were not specified in the contracts, or the date the study was received was not available. Consequently, we were unable to determine if these 16 studies were on time.

Most MMS Officials Believed Program Studies Were Useful, Timely, of High Quality, and Needed

Most MMS officials we surveyed who used program studies said they were useful, timely, of high quality, and needed. We obtained MMS opinions on all except 3 of the 106 contracts that we reviewed.[5] Most MMS officials thought program studies were useful for their purposes. Table 2.2 shows the reported degree of usefulness. MMS officials believed that all studies were at least somewhat useful because program studies were both needed and of high quality. Need was cited as a reason for usefulness for 82 of the contracts (80 percent), whereas quality was cited as a reason for usefulness for 83 of the contracts (81 percent). (App. II contains the questionnaire we used to obtain MMS officials' opinions and summarizes their responses.)

[5]Three contracts were not included because they were for uses unrelated to lease sales.

Table 2.2: Summary of MMS Survey Results on Usefulness, Timeliness, Quality, and Need for Program Studies

Study characteristics	Number of contracts	Percentage of contracts
Usefulness[a]		
Very to extremely useful	75	73
Somewhat to moderately useful	16	15
Of little or no use	0	0
No response	12	12
Total	**103**	**100**
Timeliness[a]		
Somewhat to very timely	65	63
Neither timely nor untimely	19	18
Somewhat to very untimely	8	8
No response	11	11
Total	**103**	**100**
Quality[b]		
Above average to excellent	86	83
Average	7	7
Below average to poor	3	3
No response	7	7
Total	**103**	**100**
Need[b]		
Definitely to probably needed	91	88
Undecided	2	2
Probably not needed	2	2
No response	8	8
Total	**103**	**100**

[a]Applies to final studies only.

[b]Does not differentiate between draft and final studies.

Most MMS officials considered program studies at least somewhat timely for their use, of average or better quality, and needed for MMS analysis. As table 2.2 shows, 63 percent of the program studies were considered timely; this was attributed to both good MMS contract administration efforts and good contractor performance. Only 8 percent of the program studies were considered untimely. In terms of quality, 83 percent of the program studies were considered of above average or better quality compared with 3 percent that were considered below average or poor. Factors contributing to MMS opinions about the quality of the studies included

- the depth of issue treatment,
- the validity of conclusions and recommendations, and
- the form in which results were presented.

In addition, MMS believed that 88 percent of the studies were needed, and only 2 percent were considered not needed.

Views of States and Others About the Program

Most groups outside MMS that we surveyed found the program studies timely, useful, of high quality, and needed. Some groups, however, such as coastal states, local governments, and Policy Committee members, believed that half of the program studies were not received in time to be used in preparing their input to MMS decision-making. The Scientific Committee members also believed that some program studies were not needed by MMS for decision making.

Most Survey Groups Considered Program Studies Timely

Most of the groups we surveyed said that the majority of program studies were received in time for their use in providing input to MMS on pre- and postlease sale activities. However, coastal states, members of the MMS Policy Committee, and individuals and organizations affiliated with local governments, questioned the timeliness of many studies. They said that they received about half of all studies too late to use. (See table 2.3.)

Table 2.3: Summary of Questionnaire Responses From Coastal States, MMS Committees, and Other Groups About Program Studies

Respondent group	Timeliness for input to MMS	Usefulness for respondent group	Study quality	Percentage of studies not needed by MMS[a]
Coastal states	Half too late	Somewhat useful	Above average	12
Policy committee	Half too late	Moderately useful	Above average	10
Scientific committee	Majority on time	Moderately useful	Average	29
Regional technical working groups	Majority on time	Moderately useful	Above average	17
Federal government	Majority on time	Moderately useful	Above average	5
State government	Majority on time	Somewhat useful	Above average	3
Local government	Half too late	Somewhat useful	Average	4
Oil and gas and related companies	Majority on time	Moderately useful	Above average	8
University and private research/ consultant	Majority on time	Moderately useful	Above average	8

[a]Percentage shown is a lower bound estimate. For the members of the groups who did not respond, we assumed they would have said that 100 percent of studies are needed by MMS.

The states of Oregon and Washington were concerned about the potential for untimely program studies. The MMS 5-year leasing schedule (dated April 1987) included a sale in the Oregon-Washington OCS for April 1992, the first since 1964. Oregon and Washington were concerned that needed environmental studies will not be available in time for this sale. The governor of Oregon commented that "an unrealistically short time frame has been created in which to identify, fund, and conduct studies, analyze results and do any follow-up studies needed for leasing and post-leasing decisions . . . ." The governor of Washington commented that his state's "main concern is that a comprehensive studies program be adopted and that studies are conducted prior to draft EIS (environmental impact statements) for the lease sale . . . ." However, in the state's opinion, the planned schedule did not provide sufficient time to prepare for the lease sale.

After Oregon and Washington provided comments to our survey, the Congress appropriated $900,000 to accelerate environmental studies for certain controversial areas of the OCS, including Washington and Oregon. MMS is planning to use $200,000 of the funds to initiate a study of commercial fisheries off the coast of Washington and Oregon 10 months earlier than originally planned.

Survey Groups Believed Program Studies Were Useful, of High Quality, and Needed by MMS

Most of the groups we surveyed believed that program studies were useful, of high quality, and needed by MMS. Most of the groups we surveyed considered program studies moderately useful. Coastal states and state and local government respondents, however, considered studies only somewhat useful. All of the groups surveyed, except the Scientific Committee and local government respondents, considered study quality to be above average. The latter two groups believed that study quality was average. (See table 2.3.)

In general, the groups we surveyed believed that most program studies were needed by MMS for lease sale decisions. With the exception of the Scientific Committee, the groups believed that at least 83 percent of the studies were needed by MMS. However, members of the Scientific Committee, who are responsible for advising MMS about the scientific value of studies, said 29 percent of the studies were not needed.

On the basis of our analysis of survey results, the following are some of the reasons survey respondents believed that MMS did not need the program studies for OCS decision-making:

- The studies replicated other studies.
- Study data were not critical to MMS decision-making.
- The studies had little or no direct application to MMS decision-making.

Views of States and Others on Past and Future Emphasis of the Program

In general, most of the states, OCS Advisory Board respondents (including Policy Committee, Scientific Advisory Committee, and regional technical working group members), and others we surveyed agreed that the program had appropriately emphasized the research topics and factors that produce environmental impacts associated with OCS oil and gas activities. Except for the Scientific Advisory Committee and local governments, the groups generally agreed that MMS should focus future program research on the topics of offshore habitats, water quality, and commercial fisheries. The groups, except for local governments, also generally agreed on the future ranking of factors that produce environmental impacts.

In analyzing the future research topics and environmental factors, we used the OCS Policy Committee as a benchmark for comparing the rankings of all other groups. We selected the Policy Committee because (1) it is tasked with providing advice and guidance to the Secretary of the Interior on the oil and gas leasing program, including environmental studies, (2) it has a broad membership, including representatives from states, federal agencies, and the private sector, and (3) it has a broad perspective of Interior's oil and gas leasing program. These factors establish the Policy Committee as an authoritative and influential group regarding future directions of the program.

Most States, Advisory Groups, and Others Agreed on Past Emphasis of the Program

In general, most of the states and others we surveyed agreed that the program had appropriately emphasized those research topics and factors that produce environmental impacts associated with OCS oil and gas activities. (See apps. III-V and tables 2.4 and 2.5 for lists of the research topics and factors.) A majority of the groups we surveyed said that 18 of the 20 research topics and factors we asked about had been appropriately emphasized.

Although seven of the nine groups said that one or more topics or factors had been underemphasized, a majority of the nine groups agreed that the program had underemphasized only two topics or factors: the impacts from trash and debris associated with OCS development and the impacts from the demolition of offshore oil and gas platforms at the conclusion of OCS development. The Scientific Committee was the only

group surveyed that said the program had greatly overemphasized any topics or factors: the study of endangered and threatened species and the study of noise emissions associated with OCS development.

Most States, Advisory Committees, and Others Agreed About Future Emphasis of the Program

Most of the states and others we surveyed agreed with the Policy Committee about what the future emphasis of the program should be. Although all the survey groups believed that each of the 12 research topics and 8 factors we asked about should receive some future emphasis, they believed certain topics and factors should be emphasized more than others. Tables 2.4 and 2.5 illustrate the Policy Committee respondents' rankings of the future emphasis each research topic and factor should receive. Table 2.4 illustrates the rankings assigned to each of the research topics by the Scientific Advisory Committee and local government respondents. Table 2.5 illustrates the rankings by local government respondents of the factors that produce environmental impacts. These were the only two groups that differed substantially from the Policy Committee. The views of all other groups were similar to those of the Policy Committee.

Table 2.4: Policy Committee, Scientific Committee, and Local Government Rankings on Future Emphasis of Program Research Topics

Ranking of emphasis	Policy Committee[a]	Scientific Committee	Local government
1	Offshore habitats	Coastal habitats	Environmental geology
2	Water quality	Physical oceanography	Endangered and threatened species
3	Commercial fisheries	Commercial fisheries	Chemical oceanography[b]
4	Environmental geology	Socioeconomic conditions	Physical oceanography[b]
5	Coastal habitats	Meteorological conditions	Air quality
6	Physical oceanography	Offshore habitats	Socioeconomic conditions
7	Endangered and threatened species	Chemical oceanography	Water quality
8	Chemical oceanography	Environmental geology	Coastal habitats
9	Socioeconomic conditions	Water quality	Wildlife species
10	Wildlife species	Air quality	Commercial fisheries
11	Air quality	Wildlife species	Offshore habitats
12	Meteorological conditions	Endangered and threatened species	Meteorological conditions

[a]The rankings of coastal states, regional technical working groups, federal government, state government, oil and gas and related companies, and university and private/research consultants were highly similar to those of the Policy Committee.

[b]For local government respondents, there was no difference in rankings for chemical oceanography and physical oceanography.

Table 2.5: Policy Committee and Local Government Rankings on Future Emphasis of Factors That Produce Environmental Impacts

Ranking of emphasis	Policy Committee[a]	Local government
1	Effluent discharges	Effluent discharges
2	Operations activities	Operations activities
3	Trash and debris	Air emissions
4	Demolition activities	Construction activities
5	Waterway traffic	Demolition activities
6	Air emissions	Waterway traffic
7	Construction activities	Noise emissions
8	Noise emissions	Trash and debris

[a]The rankings of coastal states, the MMS Scientific Committee, regional technical working groups, federal government, state government, oil and gas and related companies, and university and private/research consultants were highly similar to those of the Policy Committee.

Offshore habitats, water quality, and commercial fisheries were among those research topics the Policy Committee respondents believed should receive the greatest program emphasis in the future. While most of the other survey groups agreed with this assessment, the Scientific Committee believed that coastal habitats and physical oceanography should receive the greatest future emphasis while local governments believed environmental geology and endangered and threatened species should receive the greatest emphasis.

Effluent discharges, operations activities, and trash and debris were among those environmental impact-producing factors that the Policy Committee respondents believed should receive the greatest future program emphasis. Local government respondents—the only group differing substantially with the rankings of the Policy Committee—agreed that effluent discharges and operations activities should get the most future emphasis but ranked other factors differently. One of the most striking differences between the two groups was the ranking of trash and debris, ranked third by the Policy Committee but eighth by local government respondents.

Conclusions

On the basis of our review, it appears that the environmental studies program is generally meeting its intended purpose of providing MMS with timely, useful, and high-quality information about the environment for making decisions concerning the development of OCS mineral resources. Non-MMS users also were generally satisfied with the usefulness and quality of the program studies. Most also said the majority of the studies were received in time for their use in providing input to MMS in lease

decisions. However, coastal states, members of the MMS Policy Committee, and individuals and organizations affiliated with local governments said they receive about half of all studies too late to use for providing input to MMS on lease sale decisions.

Consolidating Alaska Program Management Functions Can Increase Efficiency

Since 1974, NOAA's role in the Alaska environmental studies program has evolved from managing most of the study contracts to managing specific studies as directed by MMS. Conversely, Interior's role has changed from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) primarily overseeing NOAA's activities to MMS actively managing about half of the ongoing contracts. While NOAA and MMS both manage contracts, reductions in funding over the last several years have made this arrangement less efficient, as evidenced by an increasing percentage of NOAA's funds being consumed by administrative functions.

To show how efficiency can be increased, we evaluated one possible alternative in which NOAA's role in Alaska would closely resemble its role in the other three OCS regions—primarily that of conducting environmental research under contract to MMS. Consolidating program management in MMS could result in a savings of up to $1.3 million a year. We did not attempt to compare these savings with other alternatives. Rather, our objective was to show the potential cost reductions attainable. Moreover, any decision to consolidate these functions clearly rests with MMS as the agency having primary program responsibility, and must consider other issues such as staffing, public perception of objectivity, and continuity of scientific expertise.

Historical Roles of MMS and NOAA in the Alaska Program

NOAA, part of the Department of Commerce, has been involved with the Alaska program since the program began in 1974. At that time, Interior's Bureau of Land Management, the agency originally responsible, lacked the oceanographic expertise to manage environmental studies of the Alaska OCS. NOAA provided the necessary expertise and ship support to manage large-scale marine environmental studies. The OCS Lands Act Amendments of 1978 required that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary of the Interior use the capabilities of Commerce on a reimbursable basis. The Congress intended that NOAA be the agency in Commerce to provide these capabilities.

In 1974 NOAA established an OCS Environmental Assessment Program (referred to in this chapter as the Alaska office) to design and manage the Alaska program. In 1975 BLM signed an agreement with NOAA to manage and conduct a program to acquire and analyze marine environmental data in those areas of the Alaska OCS identified by BLM for potential oil and gas exploration. BLM maintained oversight of NOAA activities and, after consulting with NOAA, could change either the work specified or the manner of performance.

The role of NOAA's Alaska office has changed over time from that of managing the entire Alaska program to that of managing specified studies in the Alaska region as directed by MMS.[1] The role of the NOAA Alaska office is that of program manager, which is different from NOAA's role in the other three OCS regions—that of serving as a researcher or data base manager. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, BLM began building up socioeconomic and marine mammals expertise in the Alaska studies program. In January 1982, when Interior consolidated in MMS the responsibility for oil and gas lease sales activities, which formerly had been performed by BLM and the U.S. Geological Survey, MMS continued assembling staff with expertise in the areas needed to manage environmental studies.

Since 1975, BLM, and then MMS, have signed basic and annual agreements establishing the terms and conditions of NOAA's involvement in the Alaska program. Basic agreements cover periods of 5 years (the most recent being signed in September 1985) and outline such things as the general responsibilities of each agency and the provisions for reviewing and/or terminating each agency's involvement. MMS and NOAA are required to annually review the terms of the basic agreement, which allows either agency to terminate the agreement upon 30 days written notice. Annual agreements are more specific and define the portion of the Alaska program to be performed by NOAA, including reporting requirements and the amount of funding MMS is to provide.

The Administrative Functions of MMS and NOAA Largely Duplicate Each Other

Both MMS and NOAA award and manage environmental studies contracts for the Alaska program. MMS administers its portion of the Alaska program through its procurement branch, located in Herndon, Virginia, and through its Alaska regional office. The procurement branch awards contracts, authorizes payment to contractors, and approves contract modifications. The Alaska regional office monitors contractor performance and distributes copies of environmental studies reports. The Alaska regional office also annually develops the draft and final Alaska regional studies plans, reviews NOAA's research proposals for the annual agreement, and reviews and approves work performed under the agreement.

NOAA administers its portion of the Alaska program through an office in Anchorage and the Western Administrative Support Center and the Pacific Marine Center, both located in Seattle. NOAA's Alaska office monitors contractor performance and distributes final environmental studies

[1]In addition to its managerial functions, NOAA has other offices, such as the National Marine Fisheries Service, that perform research for the Alaska studies program.

reports. This office also proposes an annual plan for Alaska studies and prepares a mid-year briefing and year-end program report detailing work accomplished and problems encountered. The support center awards program contracts, authorizes payments to contractors, and approves contract modifications. The Pacific Marine Center provides ships that support Alaska program research.

MMS receives annual appropriations for the environmental studies program. Through the annual agreement, MMS pays for NOAA's Alaska office program activities, including research and the salaries and expenses of NOAA personnel who manage the program. NOAA provides ships, at no cost to MMS, for program research from its fleet of 23 vessels. This fleet supports research programs and projects conducted by NOAA, MMS, and other federal agencies.

Funds for the Alaska Program Have Been Declining

In recent years, Alaska program funding and the number of contracts managed by MMS and awarded and managed by NOAA have declined. NOAA's management costs—those costs incurred by NOAA to manage its portion of the Alaska studies program—have increased to about 35 percent of its Alaska studies program costs reimbursed by MMS.

Funding for the Alaska program—for both MMS and NOAA—has decreased. Table 3.1 shows the funding levels for fiscal years 1974-87 and an estimate of the funding level for fiscal year 1988. Annual funding peaked at $29.1 million in fiscal year 1976, declined to $8.5 million by fiscal year 1987, with a fiscal year 1988 estimate of $7.3 million. The chief of MMS' branch of environmental studies said that the large amount of information already collected for Alaska and the decline in the oil industry's interest in the area have led to a decline in the priority of the Alaska studies program.

Table 3.1: Budget for Alaska Region Environmental Studies Program—Fiscal Years 1974-88

Dollars in Millions

Fiscal year	NOAA program	MMS/BLM program	Total
1974	$1.7	$0.0	$1.7
1975	7.7	2.3	10.0
1976[a]	27.9	1.2	29.1
1977	21.1	0.7	21.8
1978	19.1	1.8	20.9
1979	14.9	3.6	18.5
1980	21.4	4.4	25.8
1981	15.9	4.4	20.3
1982	10.4	4.4	14.8
1983	9.3	4.5	13.8
1984	7.8	6.1	13.9
1985	7.2	3.8	11.0
1986	6.9	4.1	11.0
1987	6.0	2.5	8.5
1988[b]	4.4	2.9	7.3

[a]Includes transition quarter.

[b]Costs for 1988 are estimated.

The decline in funding is reflected in a declining number of research contracts managed by MMS and awarded and managed by NOAA. Tables 3.2 and 3.3 identify the number of contracts awarded and managed by each agency from fiscal years 1974 through 1987. The sharpest decline in contracts awarded and total contracts managed has been at NOAA—from 100 and 169 in fiscal year 1976 to 3 and 35 in fiscal year 1987, respectively.

Table 3.2: Alaska Program Contracts Awarded by MMS and NOAA—Fiscal Years 1974-87

Fiscal year	MMS awarded	NOAA awarded	Total awarded
1974	0	11	**11**
1975	7	74	**81**
1976[a]	3	100	**103**
1977	2	22	**24**
1978	7	8	**15**
1979	7	2	**9**
1980	23	21	**44**
1981	11	11	**22**
1982	15	16	**31**
1983	17	22	**39**
1984	23	33	**56**
1985	12	11	**23**
1986	14	11	**25**
1987	15	3	**18**

[a]Includes the transition quarter.

Table 3.3: Alaska Program Contracts Managed by MMS and NOAA—Fiscal Years 1974-87

Fiscal year	MMS managed	NOAA managed	Total managed
1974	0	11	**11**
1975	7	85	**92**
1976[a]	8	169	**177**
1977	9	149	**158**
1978	11	125	**136**
1979	15	102	**117**
1980	31	105	**136**
1981	36	102	**138**
1982	37	103	**140**
1983	41	89	**130**
1984	49	91	**140**
1985	44	73	**117**
1986	39	52	**91**
1987	38	35	**73**

[a]Includes the transition quarter.

Duplicative Administrative Functions Have Become Less Efficient

We believe that the drop in Alaska program funding and reductions in the number of contracts awarded and managed has resulted in the Alaska studies program becoming less efficient. For example, table 3.4 shows that NOAA's management costs as a percentage of total costs have increased fairly steadily since the late 1970s, rising to an estimated 35 percent of total costs in fiscal year 1988.

Table 3.4: NOAA's Alaska Program Management Costs as a Percentage of Costs Reimbursed by MMS—Fiscal Years 1974-88

Dollars in Millions

Fiscal year	Costs reimbursed by MMS[a]	Management costs	Management costs as a percentage of total costs
1974	$1.66	$.14	8.4
1975	7.66	1.96	25.6
1976[b]	27.90	2.83	10.1
1977	21.10	1.52	7.2
1978	19.10	1.75	9.2
1979	14.85	2.20	14.8
1980	21.44	2.67	12.5
1981	15.86	3.34	21.1
1982	10.41	1.96	18.8
1983	9.33	1.59	17.0
1984	7.84	1.45	18.5
1985	7.19	1.44	20.0
1986	6.86	1.67	24.3
1987	6.04	1.71	28.3
1988[c]	4.35	1.53	35.2

[a]Includes research and management (salaries, travel, equipment, supplies, and overhead) costs.

[b]Includes 1976 transition quarter.

[c]Costs for 1988 are estimated.

Source: NOAA.

Similarly, table 3.5 shows that while program funding, contracts awarded, and contracts managed for both NOAA and MMS decreased from fiscal year 1983 to fiscal year 1987, program staff in both agencies remained relatively constant.

Table 3.5: NOAA and MMS Alaska Program Environmental Studies Funding, Contracts Awarded, Contracts Managed, and Staffing—Fiscal Years 1983 and 1987

Dollars in millions

	NOAA			MMS		
	Fiscal Year		Percent	Fiscal Year		Percent
	1983	1987	change[a]	1983	1987	change[a]
Program funding	$9.3	$6.0	(36)	$4.5	$2.5	(44)
Contracts awarded	22	3	(86)	17	15	(12)
Contracts managed	89	35	(61)	41	38	(07)
Staffing[b]	13	14	08	16	16	00

[a]Numbers in parentheses are negative numbers.

[b]Excludes MMS and NOAA procurement staff.

According to the chief of MMS' branch of environmental studies, MMS may have to reassign staff to other Alaska branches or other MMS regions if the number of contracts continues to decline, and the Alaska studies section chief said that MMS will look very critically at whether to fill any current or future vacancies. Conversely, NOAA officials believe that NOAA's Alaska office staffing level cannot be reduced further without adversely affecting NOAA's ability to maintain scientific expertise and responsiveness to MMS.

Consolidating Administrative Functions Can Increase Efficiency

If, as NOAA contends, its Alaska office staffing level cannot be reduced further without adversely affecting program expertise and responsiveness, other alternatives to increasing program efficiency should be explored. We evaluated the alternative of consolidating the administrative functions in MMS because (1) program responsibility rests primarily within Interior, (2) yearly appropriations are made to MMS, which, in turn, pays for NOAA's Alaska office program activities, and (3) NOAA's role in the other three OCS regions is primarily to conduct environmental research. We found that up to $1.3 million a year could be saved if program management were consolidated in MMS. While we did not specifically evaluate cost savings possible by consolidating the functions in NOAA, we believe this also could result in savings over the current arrangement if MMS staff were reduced.

On August 28, 1987, MMS provided data we requested on the annual costs and personnel that would be required if MMS were to assume NOAA's Alaska program functions. MMS estimated it would need four positions in Alaska—organic chemist, logistics technician, data manager, and clerk/

typist—and up to four contract specialists in the Herndon, Virginia, procurement branch to assume NOAA's functions, depending on future work loads.

On the basis of the data MMS provided, we estimate that up to $1.3 million a year could be saved by consolidating NOAA's administrative functions relating to the Alaska program in MMS. (See table 3.6.) MMS and NOAA also identified one-time costs of about $143,000 to consolidate the program ($120,000 for MMS to relocate staff to Alaska, $15,000 to transfer equipment and material, and $8,400 for miscellaneous travel costs). These one-time costs are not included in the annual savings calculation.

Table 3.6: Estimated Annual Savings if Administrative Functions Are Consolidated in MMS

NOAA costs no longer incurred		
Program management[a]		$1,525,000
Additional MMS costs		
Personnel	$207,000	
Equipment/storage space	25,000	
Travel	20,000	
		252,000
Savings to MMS		$1,273,000

[a]Fiscal year 1988 estimate. These costs are actually paid by MMS through its annual agreement with NOAA.

Source: MMS.

On the basis of current work load, we estimate that MMS will incur additional personnel costs of about $207,000 for the four positions in Alaska and one contract specialist. MMS estimated that another $45,000 would be required for additional equipment, storage space, and travel to monitor contracts transferred from NOAA. The $1.3 million annual savings is the difference between costs NOAA no longer would incur and MMS' additional costs to assume NOAA's functions.[2]

[2]In addition, MMS estimated that $768,000 would be required for ship time now provided by NOAA at no charge. However, this would be offset by a corresponding reduction in the funding NOAA would incur for ship support for MMS.

Other Issues to Be Considered in Any Decision to Consolidate

While it makes sense to consolidate MMS and NOAA contract award and administrative functions to achieve greater efficiency, other issues must also be considered. Staffing is one such issue. For actual savings to occur, positions must be eliminated or not filled or staff must be moved elsewhere in the federal government where there is a need. Under the alternative of consolidating the administrative functions in MMS, NOAA staff would be reduced or used elsewhere.

In the past, NOAA reduced its Alaska office staff. For example, in fiscal year 1980, NOAA reduced its Alaska office staff by 35 percent from 40 to 26 when its studies program office was being moved from Boulder, Colorado, to Juneau, Alaska. NOAA also reduced its Alaska office staff by 2, from 14 to 12, in fiscal year 1988 by not filling vacant positions. NOAA has also used its Alaska office staff to perform work other than contract administration. For example, in fiscal year 1988, NOAA proposed and MMS approved $128,000 to perform such tasks as collecting field samples and preparing reports. Further, according to the chief of NOAA's ocean assessments division, some staff are being used to conduct work funded by other agencies, such as the Environmental Protection Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers. Therefore, given the relatively small number of staff in NOAA's Alaska office, it seems reasonable that they can be transferred to other positions in NOAA or elsewhere in the federal government where their expertise is needed.

Program credibility is another issue that must be considered. NOAA officials in the office of oceanography and marine assessments and its Alaska office believe that NOAA brings objectivity to the Alaska environmental studies program. The director of the office of oceanography and marine assessments pointed out that MMS' responsibility for developing OCS oil and gas resources reduces MMS' ability to be unbiased. The director of MMS' Alaska OCS region said MMS' public planning process, including environmental impact statement preparation and public hearings, ensures that MMS remains objective and independent.

Another issue MMS must consider is that needed scientific expertise is not lost because of consolidation. For example, the director of NOAA's office of oceanography and marine assessments identified physical and chemical oceanography, biological sciences, and ecosystems research as some of the scientific expertise provided by NOAA. Such expertise should be maintained if MMS chooses to absorb NOAA's administrative functions. This could be accomplished by MMS hiring those NOAA professionals with the expertise MMS needs to work in the studies program office.

Finally, because MMS has primary program responsibility, a decision to consolidate contract award and administration functions in another agency must recognize that MMS may need resources to adequately monitor program implementation.

Conclusions

Reductions in funding for the Alaska environmental studies program over the last several years have made the duplication of administrative functions that exist between MMS and NOAA less efficient. Our work has shown that consolidating program management within MMS can result in savings of up to $1.3 million a year. However, in making a decision to consolidate, MMS must also consider other issues, including staffing, public perception of MMS' objectivity in addressing environmental concerns, and the continuity of needed scientific expertise.

Recommendation

We recommend that the Secretary of the Interior direct the Director of MMS to develop alternatives for making more efficient the Alaska environmental studies program contract award and administration functions currently carried out by both NOAA and MMS. In deciding which alternative to pursue, MMS should consider not only potential dollar savings but also other issues, such as staffing, public perception of objectivity, and continuity of scientific expertise.

BLANK PAGE

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

In an August 20, 1986, letter, the Chairman, Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources Subcommittee, House Committee on Government Operations, raised concerns about Interior's OCS Environmental Studies Program. As agreed with the Chairman's office, we focused our efforts on three objectives: (1) identifying how MMS used program information for OCS decision-making and determining the level of satisfaction of MMS, states, and others with program studies, (2) determining whether delivery of environmental studies is timely in relation to original due dates and planned lease uses, and (3) determining whether Alaska program resources can be used more efficiently.

We conducted audit work in each of MMS' four OCS regional offices in Vienna, Virginia; New Orleans, Louisiana; Los Angeles, California; and Anchorage, Alaska; and at MMS headquarters in Washington, D.C. We also performed work at NOAA's program office in Anchorage; NOAA's Office of Oceanography and Marine Assessments in Rockville, Maryland; and at NOAA's Western Administrative Support Center in Seattle, Washington.

Determining MMS Use of and Satisfaction With Program Studies

To determine how program information is used for OCS decision-making, we reviewed 106 contracts out of a total of 197 contracts awarded during fiscal years 1983 to 1985. The 106 contracts selected were identified by MMS as having been completed or closed as of our cut-off date of December 31, 1986 and/or that we determined had either received, or appeared to have received, a final study report as of the cut-off date. We reviewed 74 contracts from the Alaska region, 6 from the Atlantic region, 9 from the Gulf of Mexico region, 13 from the Pacific region, and 4 from program headquarters. We also surveyed MMS headquarters and regional officials about how these studies were used and solicited opinions from MMS officials about the quality, timeliness, and usefulness of these studies. Information collected on the studies included MMS' actual and intended use(s) of the studies and the priority assigned to these studies in regional studies plans. Program contracts called for many types of products such as hard-copy reports, computer tapes, and maps. In this report, the term "studies" is used to refer to all types of products.

We developed and sent a structured data collection instrument to MMS officials to obtain information on how studies from the 106 contracts were actually used. We also requested documentation of the major uses identified (e.g., citation in environmental impact statements and citation in Secretarial Issue Documents) and conducted interviews with MMS

headquarters and regional officials to verify the accuracy and completeness of information provided.

In addition, we asked MMS officials that use program studies to complete a questionnaire soliciting opinions about the quality, timeliness, and usefulness of studies from 103 of the 106 contracts (see app. II). (Three contracts were not included because they were for uses unrelated to lease sales.) We solicited information from MMS and NOAA contracting officers' technical representatives regarding the type and frequency of contract monitoring. In all, we collected information from 266 MMS and NOAA staff, many of whom provided data for more than one contract.

Our questionnaire asked MMS users to rate several aspects of program study quality, including the overall quality of each study. To determine the extent to which specific aspects of program study quality could explain ratings of overall quality, we performed a multiple regression analysis on seven aspects of study quality:

- depth of issue treatment in program studies,
- objectivity of program studies,
- reliability of program study results,
- validity of data gathered,
- validity of conclusions and recommendations,
- ability to generalize study findings, and
- form in which results were communicated.

These seven aspects of study quality explained 83 percent of the variability across contracts in overall study report quality. Three of the aspects contributed uniquely to explaining this variability: depth of issue treatment, validity of conclusions and recommendations, and form in which results were communicated. We defined these three as important factors affecting individual perceptions of overall study quality. (Although contracts in this analysis were not randomly selected, we used tests of significance of the regression coefficients as criteria for selecting important explanatory factors.) The remaining four aspects of quality correlated highly with overall quality ratings, but their contribution in explaining the variability in these overall ratings overlapped with that of the other quality characteristics. This analysis allowed us to report on the perceived quality of program study reports.

Determining States' and Others' Satisfaction With the Program

To determine states' and others' satisfaction with the program, we used a mail-in questionnaire to survey three groups of non-MMS study users: (1) governors of coastal states, (2) OCS Advisory Board members active as of January 1986, and (3) a random sample of individuals and organizations on MMS distribution lists (see apps. III through V). These surveys were conducted between April and July 1987 and all three groups received identical surveys. Individuals not responding to the original mailing were sent follow-up questionnaires to encourage response.

We surveyed governors of 24 coastal states. Of these, we received 23 responses.[1] In some instances, the governors asked that the survey response of their official representative on the OCS Advisory Board be used as the official state response.

To survey OCS Advisory Board members (including Policy Committee, Scientific Advisory Committee, and regional technical working group members), we obtained from MMS a list of OCS Advisory Board members as of January 1986. Of the 124 members active as of that date, 105 responded to our survey or contacted us about their response. Some individuals in the same organization submitted a joint response to represent their collective views, and a number of those who officially represent their state on an OCS Advisory Board committee said that the official response from their state represented their views. Our analysis of Advisory Board members included official responses from coastal states as indicated, and we weighted collective responses by the number of individuals or organizations represented by the response.

We reported responses of the OCS Policy Committee, Scientific Advisory Committee, and regional technical working groups separately. Individuals serving on more than one of these groups were included in the analyses of each committee. Because of this overlap, results of these three committees are not mutually independent.

To survey other non-MMS program study users, we obtained copies of MMS' distribution lists for program study reports and related mailings. To the extent possible, we eliminated duplicate names, MMS employees, OCS Advisory Board members from 1982 to 1986, and libraries and

[1]The governors of Alabama, Alaska, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia, and Washington responded. Although Hawaii and Pennsylvania responded, they had no opinions about the program. We received no response from Texas.

repositories. From the resulting list of 2,973 names, we randomly sampled 698. The sample size was selected to ensure that the sampling error for estimates of percentages did not exceed 5 percent at the .95 confidence level and so that comparisons among study users in the four OCS regions would be statistically feasible. A breakdown of our sample's response characteristics is given in table I.1.

Table I.1: Response Characteristics of Random Sample Respondents in Survey

Characteristic	Number in sample	Percent
Initial sample	698	100
No current address	−32	−5
Duplicates/ineligibles	−3	−0
Total surveyed	**663**	**95**
Responded and completed questionnaire	444	67
Responded but did not complete questionnaire	78	12
Total responded	**522**	**79[a]**
No response	141	21

[a]Response percentages are based on the total number surveyed.

Of those we surveyed, 79 percent (522) returned questionnaires or contacted us to explain why they were not completing the questionnaire. In some instances, two or more individuals from the same organization submitted a single response to represent their combined views. In our analysis we weighted the single response by the number of individuals or organizations it represented.

For many of the analyses involving the random sample, we grouped responses by the respondents' organizational affiliations. There was a sufficient number of respondents in five independent organizational categories to make statistical comparisons among these groups feasible. These organizational categories are state government, local government, federal government, oil and oil-related companies, and universities and private sector researchers.

We tested for statistical significance where appropriate when we compared responses among the subgroups of the random sample, the three OCS Advisory Board committees, and coastal states.

Because of the diversity of our questions and the special knowledge required to answer some of them, the number of respondents who provided an opinion for each question varied. Our findings reflect an analysis of the effects, if any, of non-responses to questions.

Determining Timeliness of Program Studies

To evaluate the timeliness of program studies, we reviewed all 197 contracts (131 administered by MMS and 66 administered by NOAA) awarded in fiscal years 1983 through 1985. We collected and compared information on dates that draft and final studies were scheduled to be and were actually received. We also interviewed contracting officers and procurement officials in MMS' Procurement Operations Branch-B in Herndon, Virginia (the office responsible for program procurement), and in NOAA's Western Administrative Support Center in Seattle about the administration of program contracts. We also interviewed contracting officers' technical representatives in each of the four MMS OCS regional offices and in NOAA's office in Anchorage.

Evaluating Whether Alaska Program Resources Can Be Used More Efficiently

To evaluate whether Alaska program resources (MMS and NOAA) can be used more efficiently, we (1) examined legislation authorizing Interior's use of the Department of Commerce to conduct environmental research, (2) reviewed the terms of annual agreements between MMS and NOAA, (3) obtained MMS' and NOAA's current and historical Alaska work load and funding statistics, and (4) interviewed MMS and NOAA officials about the future status of the NOAA Alaska program and the degree of expertise possessed by each agency. We did not independently verify current or historical statistics of NOAA's Alaska work load or funding levels.

We discussed with MMS and NOAA officials claims by NOAA that NOAA conducts more objective environmental research than MMS. We obtained these officials' opinions about the quality of environmental research produced by both agencies. We also analyzed responses from our non-MMS user survey to questions related to the Alaska program on study characteristics such as objectivity and reliability of study methods. This analysis did not allow us to compare the quality of research produced by MMS or NOAA but did allow us to assess whether non-MMS users viewed these study characteristics differently in Alaska than in other OCS regions. To the extent possible, we searched for, but were unable to find in our questionnaire responses from non-MMS users of program studies (see ch. 2), evidence that would support or contradict the view that one of NOAA's contributions to the Alaska program is objectivity. We did not

conduct an analysis of either contract statements of work or program study reports to determine the objectivity of studies by either agency.

We also did not independently verify the expected personnel or cost impacts identified by MMS should MMS take over the duties and responsibilities of NOAA. We requested both MMS and NOAA to analyze the expected personnel and cost impacts should NOAA's portion of the program be consolidated into MMS. MMS prepared such an analysis in August 1987; however, NOAA declined, citing a belief that it will not be terminated from the Alaska program.

Evaluating Non-MMS Opinions on the Future Emphasis of the Program

To evaluate non-MMS opinions on the future emphasis of the program, we developed a proposed "agenda" for future research for each of the nine interest groups in our survey (coastal states, three OCS Advisory Board committees, and five subgroups of the random sample). Although our survey did not directly ask respondents to rank research topics for future emphasis of the program, we developed a preferred order for each respondent on the basis of their answers to questions 29 and 32 in our questionnaire (see apps. III through V). We did this by applying a statistical procedure (normalized ipsatization) to responses that removed any individual tendencies to give uniformly high or low ratings to all topics or to give the same response to all topics. These adjusted answers were aggregated across respondents in an interest group and the aggregate response was used to order topics into an agenda.

Finally, we assessed the correspondence of agendas across the nine interest groups. We did this by first correlating each interest group's agenda with those of all other interest groups. Twenty-one of the 36 possible correlations across research topics were significant. All of the nonsignificant correlations involved either the Scientific Advisory Committee or local governments. A factor analysis of the correlation matrix indicated that only three unique agendas for research topics existed among the interest groups. These agendas are best described by the agendas for the Scientific Advisory Committee, local governments, and all others combined.

With respect to research on factors that produce environmental impact, there were only two unique agendas, best described by the agendas for local governments and all others combined. All seven of the nonsignificant correlations in this analysis involved local governments.

Our work was conducted between August 1986 and March 1988 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. We discussed the results of our review with agency officials and have incorporated their comments where appropriate. At the Chairman's request, we did not ask the agencies for official comments on a draft of this report.

MMS and NOAA Officials' Responses to Our Questionnaire

U. S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

SURVEY ON CHARACTERISTICS OF ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES[1]

(Contract number for study _____)

1. Which of the following units best describes your response status for this study? (Check one box.)

1. [87] Environmental Assessment
2. [19] Environmental Operations
3. [12] Environmental Studies
4. [7] Environmental Modeling
5. [27] Other (specify):

2. Did you use or intend to use either the draft or final product associated with this study for MMS analysis? (Check one box for each question.)

Intend?	1. [184] Yes	2. [62] No
Use?	1. [179] Yes	2. [72] No

If you answered "No" to both questions, skip to Question 11.

3. Based on your use or intended use of this study, how timely or untimely would you say the draft and final products were? (Check one box for each product.)

Draft Product

1. [44] Very timely
2. [26] Somewhat timely
3. [18] Neither timely nor untimely
4. [9] Somewhat untimely
5. [2] Very untimely
6. [9] No experience with draft product
7. [9] No draft product for study

Final Product

1. [39] Very timely
2. [26] Somewhat timely
3. [19] Neither timely nor untimely
4. [7] Somewhat untimely
5. [1] Very untimely
6. [0] No experience with final product
7. [0] No final product for study

4. For your purposes, how useful, if at all, were the draft and final products for this study? (Check one box for each product.)

Draft Product

1. [29] Extremely useful
2. [46] Very useful
3. [12] Moderately useful
4. [3] Somewhat useful
5. [0] Of little or no use
6. [0] No experience with draft product
7. [0] No draft product for study

Final Product

1. [33] Extremely useful
2. [42] Very useful
3. [15] Moderately useful
4. [1] Somewhat useful
5. [0] Of little or no use
6. [0] No experience with final product
7. [0] No final product for study

[1] Responses to questions should total to 103 (number of studies surveyed) or to 266 (number of questionnaires completed by MMS and NOAA officials). However, MMS officials did not complete all questions for all studies. NOAA officials provided responses to questions 11 through 19 only.

5. In your opinion, how much did each of the following factors contribute to or detract from the timeliness of the draft and final products for this study? (Check one box for each factor.)

	Greatly Contributed 1	Somewhat Contributed 2	Neither Contributed nor Detracted 3	Somewhat Detracted 4	Greatly Detracted 5	No Basis to Judge 6
Contractor performance	43	28	10	8	4	0
Contract administration	22	40	24	5	1	0
Product revisions	5	27	42	7	2	0
Changes in intended use or in need	3	10	63	3	0	0
Other (specify):	8	2	1	2	4	0

6. In your opinion, how much did each of the following factors contribute to or detract from the usefulness of the draft and final products for this study? (Check one box for each factor.)

	Greatly Contributed 1	Somewhat Contributed 2	Neither Contributed nor Detracted 3	Somewhat Detracted 4	Greatly Detracted 5	No Basis to Judge 6
Timeliness or untimeliness of study	26	35	27	8	1	0
Study quality	55	28	4	4	1	0
Need for the study	60	22	11	0	0	0
Fit between intended purpose and actual results of study	44	28	17	2	1	0
Other (Specify):	5	2	0	0	2	0

7. Based on your actual use or intended use of this study to perform MMS analysis, would you now say this study was or was not needed? (Check one box.)

1. [73] Definitely needed
2. [19] Probably needed
3. [2] Undecided
4. [2] Probably not needed
5. [0] Definitely not needed

8. In your opinion, how excellent or poor was the study with respect to each of the following characteristics? (Check one box for each characteristic.)

	Excellent 1	Above Average 2	Average 3	Below Average 4	Poor 5	No Basis To Judge 6
1. Importance of issues studied	56	31	5	0	0	0
2. Depth of issue treatment	32	47	9	3	1	0
3. Objectivity	31	45	11	1	1	0
4. Reliability of study methods	26	52	19	0	0	0
5. Validity of data gathered	29	50	11	1	0	0
6. Validity of conclusions and recommendations	27	43	11	4	0	0
7. Ability to generalize findings	21	49	18	4	0	0
8. Contribution to knowledge in the field	43	40	13	1	0	0
9. Contribution to future research ideas	34	37	16	4	0	0
10. Form in which results were communicated	26	48	19	3	0	0
11. Integration of results with other impact data	18	50	16	1	1	0
12. Other (specify):	3	0	0	0	1	0

9. In your opinion, how excellent or poor was the overall quality of this study? (Check one box.)

1. [43] Excellent
2. [44] Above Average
3. [7] Average
4. [2] Below Average
5. [1] Poor

10. Considering study usefulness, timeliness and quality, overall how satisified or dissatisfied were you with this study? (Check one box.)

1. [69] Very satisfied
2. [19] Somewhat satisfied
3. [4] Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4. [2] Somewhat dissatisfied
5. [2] Very dissatisfied

11. Were you an official Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) for this study? (Check one box.)

1. [90] Yes (Continue to Q. 12)
2. [13] No (Skip to Q. 19)

12. For approximately how long were you the COTR for this study? (Enter years or fraction of a year.) [2]

1.5 Year(s)

13. Which of the following methods were used to notify the public that the draft and/or final products were available? (Check all that apply.)

1. [52] Direct mailing of products to names on distribution lists
2. [35] Direct notification of availability to states, local governments, industry groups and their representatives or others
3. [41] Announcement or listing in regional or national catalog of OCS/ESP products
4. [24] Publication of study or study abstracts in professional or technical journals
5. [39] Formal presentation of study at professional and/or technical meetings
6. [14] Other (specify):

14. In your opinion, how effectively or ineffectively did MMS publicize the availability of this study? (Check one box.)

1. [20] Very Effectively
2. [21] Somewhat Effectively
3. [30] Undecided
4. [5] Somewhat Ineffectively
5. [0] Very Ineffectively

15. During the period that the contract for this study was in force, about how often, if at all, did you communicate with the contractor? (Check one box.)

1. [17] Weekly
2. [22] Biweekly
3. [32] Monthly
4. [8] Bimonthly
5. [19] Less than bimonthly
6. [2] Not at all

[2] Number shown is the average of COTRs that responded.

16. Approximately what percentage of your communications with the contractor were in each of the following categories? (Enter one percentage for each category, including 0's where appropriate.)[3]

1. Phone Calls	54 %
2. Written Communications	28 %
3. On-site Visits	5 %
4. Detailed Records Inspections	8 %
5. Other (specify): _____	7 %
TOTAL	100 %

17. How much, if at all, did each of the following factors help or interfere with your ability to communicate with the contractor? (Check one box for each factor.)

	Greatly Helped 1	Somewhat Helped 2	Neither Helped nor Interfered 3	Somewhat Interfered 4	Greatly Interfered 5
Location of the contractor	8	7	51	21	1
Availability of the contractor	26	14	34	12	2
Available funding	15	5	61	6	1
Available time	10	7	56	13	2
Other (specify):	1	0	0	1	4

18. In your opinion, how sufficient or insufficient was the contract monitoring for this study? (Check one box.)

1. [52] Very sufficient
2. [31] Somewhat sufficient
3. [5] Undecided
4. [2] Somewhat insufficient
5. [1] Very insufficient

3 Numbers shown are the average of studies for which COTRs responded.

19. Comments. Please use this space to provide any comments you may have about the timeliness, usefulness, quality or need for this study; or about how the contract administration for this study might have been improved.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Coastal States' Responses to Our Questionnaire

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

SURVEY ON USE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT DATA
PROVIDED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES PROGRAM
OF THE MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

INSTRUCTIONS:

The U.S. General Accounting Office is an agency of the Congress responsible for evaluating Federal programs. We are currently conducting a review of the Outer Continental Shelf Environmental Studies Program which is administered by the Minerals Management Service of the Department of the Interior.

As part of our review we are contacting individuals who have participated in the management of the program as well as a randomly selected sample of people and organizations who have expressed an interest in the Environmental Studies Program since October 1982. Because you are one of only a small number of people we are contacting, your reply to our questionnaire--whether or not you use studies from the program--is of great importance to us.

There is a small possibility that you may receive two requests to complete this questionnaire: one directly from us and one from your employer. If this occurs, please follow the instructions in Question 1.

The questionnaire should take approximately 30-45 minutes to complete. Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope within 5 days of receiving it. Your responses will be combined with those of others and reported in summary form to the U.S. Congress.

If you have any questions, please call Richard Jorgenson, Tom Reilly or Doug Glovier: telephone number (202) 275-8904 or (202) 254-7392.

In the event that the return envelope is misplaced, the return address is:

Mr. Richard Jorgenson
Room 4476
U.S. General Accounting Office
441 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20548

Environmental Studies Program

The Environmental Studies Program (ESP) of the Minerals Management Service (MMS) was designed to provide information for assessment and management of environmental impacts on the human, marine and coastal environments of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) and coastal areas which may be affected by oil and gas development.

Information gathered through the ESP is used by MMS as an information base for OCS leasing and management decisions. It is also used by private industry, academic institutions, other federal or state government agencies, and concerned citizens. Study information is received by MMS from various contractors in many forms such as hard copy reports, data reports, maps, and computer tapes.

The ESP was established in 1973. Until October 1982, it was administered by the Bureau of Land Management. Since October 1982 it has been administered by MMS.

To the extent possible, please answer our questionnaire based on your experiences with the program under MMS's administration of it, October 1982 to the present.

INTRODUCTION

1. Have you received more than one copy of this questionnaire? (Check one.) CD(1) (6)

1. [2] To date this is the only copy I have received.
2. [ ] This is the second copy I have received. My answers on this copy are different from my initial response.
3. [ ] This is the second copy I have received. My answers on this copy would be the same as my initial response. (Skip to Q39)

2. Which of the following categories best describes your primary personal or organizational affiliation for your dealings with the Environmental Studies Program (ESP)? (Check one.) (7-8)

1. [2] State government
2. [ ] Local government
3. [ ] Oil or natural gas company
4. [ ] Other oil or gas related company
5. [ ] Trade association
6. [ ] Fisheries group
7. [ ] Environmental interest group
8. [ ] University
9. [ ] Private research/consultant
10. [ ] Federal government (specify department and agency):
11. [ ] Library/repository (Stop here. Please return your questionnaire in the enclosed envelope so that we can properly count you in our statistics.)
12. [ ] Other (specify):

3. Are you completing this questionnaire as an individual or for your organization? (Check one.) (9)

1. [ ] As an individual
2. [ ] For my organization

4. Approximately how long have you or your organization been involved with the ESP and/or receiving or using its studies? (Enter number of years or fraction of a year.) (10-11)

8.5 Years

5. With approximately how many ESP studies or reports are you or your organization at least somewhat familiar? (Check one.) (12)

1. [ ] None
2. [ ] 1 - 5
3. [ ] 6 - 10
4. [ ] 11 - 15
5. [ ] 16 - 20
6. [ ] More than 20

ACQUISITION OF ESP STUDIES

6. In your opinion, how helpful or unhelpful has MMS been in providing information about ongoing ESP studies? (Check one.) (13)

1. [ ] Very helpful
2. [ ] Somewhat helpful
3. [ ] Undecided
4. [ ] Somewhat unhelpful
5. [ ] Very unhelpful
6. [ ] No opinion

7. Which of the following methods describes how you or your organization usually learn that a completed ESP study is available? (Check all that apply.)
(14-18)

1. [17] Review MMS quarterly listing of completed offshore publications
2. [10] Hear about study from informal contacts with MMS officials
3. [11] Am on MMS distribution list and receive studies directly
4. [3] Learn about study from other MMS sources (specify):
5. [3] Other (specify):

8. From which of the following sources do you or your organization typically obtain copies of ESP studies or study reports? (Check all that apply.)
(19-23)

1. [28] MMS directly
2. [5] National Technical Information Service
3. [0] Public or private library*
4. [1] Other (specify):*
5. [0] Have not obtained any studies*

* If you checked categories 3, 4 or 5, SKIP TO Q16

9. Are there any ESP studies or study reports that you or your organization have requested which were never delivered? (Check one.)
(24)

1. [1] Yes
2. [20] No (SKIP TO Q11)

10. Which of the following reasons explains why the study (or studies) were not delivered? (Check all that apply.)
(25-29)

1. [1] Study or report was out of print
2. [1] Copies of study were unavailable
3. [0] Request was lost or misplaced
4. [1] Reason not known
5. [0] Other (specify):

11. About how long does it typically take from the time you or your organization request a published study or interim information about a study until you receive it? (Check one.)
(30)

1. [17] A few weeks
2. [1] A month
3. [0] 2 - 3 months
4. [0] 4 - 5 months
5. [0] 6 months or longer

12. In general, about how many separate requests for a published study or interim information about a study do you or your organization make before you receive it? (Check one.)
(31)

1. [18] One
2. [0] Two
3. [0] Three or more

13. How would you characterize the reproduction quality (legibility, completeness) of most study or report copies that you or your organization have received? (Check one.)
(32)

1. [7] Excellent
2. [8] Above Average
3. [5] Average
4. [0] Below Average
5. [0] Poor

14. How often, if at all, have you or your organization received copies of unrequested ESP studies? (Check one.) (33)

1. [4] Rarely, if ever
2. [1] On occasion
3. [4] Often
4. [ ] Very often
5. [ ] Extremely often

15. How often, if at all, have you or your organization received more than the requested number of copies of a study? (Check one.) (34)

1. [1] Rarely, if ever
2. [5] On occasion
3. [1] Often
4. [0] Very often
5. [1] Extremely often

USE AND QUALITY OF ESP STUDIES

MMS originally planned and funded many ESP studies for use in its management of proposed lease sales and post sale activities. We are interested in your experiences with studies that you or your organization planned to use for pre or post sale activities as well as studies that you had no prior intent to use for lease sale activities.

16. To what extent, if at all, did you or your organization intend to use one or more ESP studies to give input to MMS on specific lease sales or post sale management decisions ? (Check one.) (35)

1. [1] Little or no extent (SKIP TO Q19)
2. [5] Some extent
3. [5] Moderate extent
4. [6] Great extent
5. [1] Very great extent

17. How timely or untimely were those studies you intended to use for input to MMS on proposed lease sales or post sale activities? (Check one.) (36)

1. [1] Extremely timely (all or almost all received in time to use)
2. [7] Moderately timely (majority received in time to use)
3. [5] Neither timely nor untimely (about half received in time and half received too late to use)
4. [3] Moderately untimely (majority received too late to use)
5. [1] Extremely untimely (all or almost all received too late to use)
6. [2] Have not received any studies

18. To what extent did the time between your request for a study and your receipt of it help or interfere with your ability to use the study? (Check one.) (37)

1. [1] Greatly helped
2. [1] Somewhat helped
3. [11] Neither helped nor interfered
4. [2] Somewhat interfered
5. [2] Greatly interfered
6. [2] Have not requested any studies

19. In your opinion, about what percent of ESP studies provided information that MMS needed and what percent were not needed by MMS for specific lease sale or post sale management decisions? (Enter one percentage for each category.)

1. 74 % Needed by MMS for pre or post lease sale decisionmaking (38-39)
2. 26 % Not needed by MMS for pre or post lease sale decisionmaking (If zero, SKIP TO Q22) (40-41)

100 % TOTAL

3. [11] No opinion (SKIP TO Q22) (42)

20. Of those studies which you believe were not needed by MMS for pre or post lease sale decisions (response category 2 in Question 19), about how many were not needed for each of the following reasons? (Check one box for each reason.)

(43-46)

	Few If Any 1	Some 2	About Half 3	Most 4	All or Almost All 5
1. They replicated other studies.	4	2	1	0	0
2. Their data was not critical to MMS decisionmaking.	1	4	2	1	1
3. They had little or no direct application to MMS decision-making.	1	3	1	1	0
4. Other (specify):	0	0	0	0	0

21. Consider again only those studies which you believe were not needed by MMS for pre or post lease sale decisions. How useful, if at all, for each of the following other purposes were these studies? (Check one box for each purpose.)

(47-52)

	Little or No Use 1	Some-what Useful 2	Moder-ately Useful 3	Very Useful 4	Ex-tremely Useful 5	No Opinion 6
1. Establish baseline information	0	4	1	1	2	1
2. Break new scientific ground	4	2	1	0	0	1
3. Add to knowledge base on effects of offshore leasing	0	5	1	2	0	1
4. Reach conclusions about OCS environment	0	4	1	1	0	1
5. Stimulate/perform subsequent research about OCS environment	0	1	5	1	0	1
6. Other (specify):	0	0	0	0	0	0

22. To what extent, if at all, have you or your organization actually used ESP studies for each of the following general purposes? (Check one box for each purpose.)

(53-64)

	Little or No Extent 1	Some Extent 2	Moderate Extent 3	Great Extent 4	Very Great Extent 5
1. Provide input during MMS pre sale planning process (e.g., comment on Environmental Impact Statements)	2	5	5	6	2
2. Provide input during MMS post sale development process (e.g., comment on exploration or production plans	7	3	6	3	1
3. Comment on MMS 5-year leasing program	2	8	4	6	0
4. Review Coastal Zone Management consistency requirements	9	5	4	2	0
5. Review or test compliance with other federal, state, or local laws	10	5	4	1	0
6. Develop, evaluate or review exploration or production plans	8	3	7	0	1
7. Develop, evaluate or review actual or proposed leasing regulations	6	2	9	3	0
8. Prepare environmental reports for your own or other organizations	10	3	3	3	0
9. Develop OCS-related policy for non-MMS agencies or organizations	10	2	4	3	0
10. Provide a basis for scientific research	10	4	4	1	1
11. Update, assess, or synthesize knowledge in a subject area	4	6	4	5	1
12. Other (specify):	0	0	0	1	0

23. In general, how timely or untimely for the purposes or actual uses you checked in Question 22 have ESP studies been? (Check one.)

(65)

1. [1] Very timely
2. [8] Somewhat timely
3. [5] Neither timely nor untimely
4. [4] Somewhat untimely
5. [2] Very untimely

24. Overall, how useful to you, if at all, have ESP studies been? (Check one.)

(66)

1. [3] Little or no use
2. [8] Somewhat useful
3. [2] Moderately useful
4. [7] Very useful
5. [1] Extremely useful

25. In your opinion, how much, if at all, do each of the following characteristics of ESP studies help or interfere with their usefulness? (Check one box for each characteristic.)

(67-74)

	Greatly Helps 1	Somewhat Helps 2	Neither Helps nor Interferes 3	Somewhat Interferes 4	Greatly Interferes 5	No Opinion 6
1. Timing of the studies	3	4	4	5	3	2
2. Quality of studies	5	5	5	3	0	3
3. Technical nature of studies	3	10	2	2	0	4
4. Topics or issues covered	4	8	1	5	0	3
5. Currentness of information	5	4	3	4	1	4
6. Objectivity of studies	4	7	4	2	0	4
7. Studies' contribution to scientific knowledge	6	9	1	0	0	4
8. Other (specify):	0	0	0	0	0	3

IU2 (1-4)
CD2 (5)

26. Based on your experience, how excellent or poor are ESP studies, in general, with respect to each of the following characteristics? (Check one box for each characteristic.)

(6-17)

	Excellent 1	Above Average 2	Average 3	Below Average 4	Poor 5	No Basis to Judge 6
1. Importance of issues studied	3	8	6	2	0	2
2. Depth of issue treatment	2	7	8	1	0	3
3. Objectivity	2	7	7	1	0	4
4. Reliability of study methods	1	9	5	1	0	5
5. Validity of data gathered	1	7	7	1	0	5
6. Validity of conclusions and recommendations	2	5	8	2	0	4
7. Ability to generalize findings	2	1	13	2	0	3
8. Contribution to knowledge in the field	4	8	7	0	0	2
9. Contribution to future research ideas	3	10	2	4	0	2
10. Form in which results are communicated	3	1	10	4	1	2
11. Integration of results with other impact data	0	1	4	7	4	3
12. Other (specify):	0	0	0	0	0	1

27. In your opinion, how excellent or poor is the overall quality of ESP studies, in general? (Check one.)

(18)

1. [3] Excellent
2. [10] Above average
3. [5] Average
4. [1] Below average
5. [0] Poor

OPINIONS ABOUT ESP STUDY PROGRAM

28. In your opinion, have ESP studies overemphasized, underemphasized or placed an appropriate level of emphasis on each of the following research topics? (Check one box for each topic.)

(19-31)

	Greatly Over-Emphasized	Somewhat Over-Emphasized	Appro-priately Emphasized	Somewhat Under-Emphasized	Greatly Under-Emphasized	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Coastal Habitats	0	2	8	6	3	2
2. Offshore Habitats	0	3	6	8	2	2
3. Endangered and Threatened Species	2	3	13	1	0	2
4. Other Wildlife Species	0	3	9	4	1	4
5. Commercial Fisheries	0	3	4	8	4	2
6. Socioeconomic Conditions	0	2	5	7	3	4
7. Water Quality	0	1	9	8	0	3
8. Air Quality	1	1	10	4	0	5
9. Meteorological Conditions	1	0	13	4	0	3
10. Chemical Oceanography	0	2	11	3	0	5
11. Physical Oceanography	1	1	14	3	0	2
12. Environmental Geology and Hazards	0	0	11	5	2	3
13. Other (specify):	1	0	0	0	2	1

29. In your opinion, to what extent should future ESP studies focus on each of the following research topics? (Check one box for each topic.)

(32-44)

	Little or No Extent 1	Some Extent 2	Moderate Extent 3	Great Extent 4	Very Great Extent 5	No Opinion 6
1. Coastal Habitats	3	1	7	7	2	1
2. Offshore Habitats	0	1	9	5	5	1
3. Endangered and Threatened Species	0	3	9	9	0	0
4. Other Wildlife Species	1	5	12	2	1	0
5. Commercial Fisheries	1	1	7	10	2	0
6. Socioeconomic Conditions	3	2	9	7	0	0
7. Water Quality	0	1	9	9	2	0
8. Air Quality	1	6	10	3	0	1
9. Meteorological Conditions	1	7	8	4	0	1
10. Chemical Oceanography	0	5	9	5	1	1
11. Physical Oceanography	0	4	8	8	1	0
12. Environmental Geology and Hazards	0	3	9	6	3	0
13. Other (specify):	0	0	0	3	3	0

30. Based on your experience, how excellent or poor is the current level of scientific knowledge about each of the following research topics related to oil and gas activities on the Outer Continental Shelf? (Check one box for each topic.)

(45-57)

	Excellent 1	Above Average 2	Average 3	Below Average 4	Poor 5	No Basis to Judge 6
1. Coastal Habitats	1	6	3	4	4	3
2. Offshore Habitats	1	5	5	6	2	2
3. Endangered and Threatened Species	1	9	6	3	0	2
4. Other Wildlife Species	0	5	8	2	2	4
5. Commercial Fisheries	1	6	4	6	2	2
6. Socioeconomic Conditions	0	3	9	4	1	4
7. Water Quality	3	8	5	1	3	1
8. Air Quality	0	3	8	3	1	6
9. Meteorological Conditions	0	1	12	2	6	0
10. Chemical Oceanography	0	5	6	5	0	5
11. Physical Oceanography	0	8	9	2	0	2
12. Environmental Geology and Hazards	0	3	9	5	0	3
13. Other (specify):	0	0	0	2	2	0

31. In your opinion, have ESP studies overemphasized, underemphasized or placed an appropriate level of emphasis on each of the following factors associated with development of oil and gas resources on the Outer Continental Shelf? (Check one box for each factor.)

(58-66)

	Greatly Over-Emphasized 1	Somewhat Over-Emphasized 2	Appro-priately Emphasized 3	Somewhat Under-Emphasized 4	Greatly Under-Emphasized 5	No Opinion 6
1. Air Emissions	1	2	6	6	1	5
2. Noise Emissions	1	1	10	3	0	5
3. Trash and Debris	1	1	4	6	2	6
4. Effluent Discharges	0	1	10	6	1	3
5. Waterway Traffic	0	1	6	4	2	8
6. Construction Activities	1	0	9	5	2	4
7. Operations Activities	0	1	11	4	1	4
8. Demolition Activities	0	1	6	5	3	6
9. Other (specify):	0	0	0	0	2	2

ID3 (1-4)
CD3 (5)

32. In your opinion, to what extent should future ESP studies focus on each of the following factors associated with development of oil and gas resources on the Outer Continental Shelf? (Check one box for each factor.)

(6-14)

	Little or No Extent 1	Some Extent 2	Moderate Extent 3	Great Extent 4	Very Great Extent 5	No Opinion 6
1. Air Emissions	4	6	5	4	1	0
2. Noise Emissions	6	5	7	1	0	1
3. Trash and Debris	2	6	7	6	0	0
4. Effluent Discharges	0	5	4	10	2	0
5. Waterway Traffic	1	6	12	1	0	1
6. Construction Activities	2	5	9	5	0	0
7. Operations Activities	1	5	7	7	1	0
8. Demolition Activities	0	8	11	2	0	0
9. Other (specify):	0	1	0	1	1	0

33. Based on your experience, how excellent or poor is the current level of scientific knowledge about each of the following factors associated with oil and gas activities on the Outer Continental Shelf? (Check one box for each factor.)

(15-23)

	Excellent 1	Above Average 2	Average 3	Below Average 4	Poor 5	No Basis to Judge 6
1. Air Emissions	0	5	7	5	0	4
2. Noise Emissions	0	4	7	3	0	7
3. Trash and Debris	1	4	5	5	1	5
4. Effluent Discharges	1	6	6	4	1	3
5. Waterway Traffic	0	2	10	4	0	5
6. Construction Activities	0	4	7	6	0	3
7. Operations Activities	1	5	6	6	0	3
8. Demolition Activities	0	1	7	7	1	4
9. Other (specify):	0	0	0	0	1	2

PARTICIPATION IN ESP PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

34. Are you now or have you been a member of any of the following MMS (or Bureau of Land Management for periods prior to October 1982) committees? (Check one box for each committee and period of membership that applies.)

	10/82 - Present	1973 - 10/82	Never a Member
OCS Policy Committee	17	5	2 (24-26)
OCS Scientific Advisory Committee	1	2	13 (27-29)
Regional Technical Working Group Committee	13	5	3 (30-32)

35. Are you now or have you been a member of any similar OCS-related committees for agencies or organizations other than MMS? (Check one box for each committee and period of membership that applies.)

	10/82 - Present	1973 - 10/82	Never a Member
OCS policy committee	3	1	13 (33-35)
OCS scientific advisory committee	0	1	16 (36-38)
Technical working group committee	5	0	12 (39-41)

36. How often, if at all, do you or your organization comment on or participate in each of the following activities related to MMS's management of the ESP? (Check one box for each activity.)

(42-46)

	Rarely, if Ever* 1	On Occasion 2	Often 3	Very Often 4	Always or Almost Always 5
Information transfer meetings	1	3	1	3	13
Development of regional studies plans	1	1	2	6	11
Development of national studies list	9	7	1	2	1
Development of program policies	5	4	2	5	4
Other (specify):	1	0	0	0	0

*If you checked rarely, if ever, for all of the above activities, SKIP TO Q38.

37. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the amount and type of feedback or response from MMS on your participation in ESP management? (Check one.)

(47)

1. [1] Greatly satisfied
2. [8] Moderately satisfied
3. [3] Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4. [7] Moderately dissatisfied
5. [0] Greatly dissatisfied

CONCLUSION

38. To what extent are your responses to this survey based on your knowledge of or experiences with the ESP program in each of the following OCS regions? (Check one box for each region.)

(48-51)

	Little or No Extent 1	Some Extent 2	Moderate Extent 3	Great Extent 4	Very Great Extent 5
1. Atlantic	6	2	1	2	10
2. Gulf of Mexico	10	3	2	1	3
3. Pacific	10	4	2	1	2
4. Alaska	11	4	2	0	1

39. Please provide the name, title, and phone number of the person we should contact if we need additional information about your responses to our survey.

Name _____

Title _____

Phone ( ) _____

Area Code Number

40. Comments: Please use the space below and the back of this page to provide any additional comments you may have concerning either the Environmental Studies Program (including suggestions for program improvements) or this survey.

Thank you for your cooperation.

OCS Advisory Board Members' Responses to Our Questionnaire

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

SURVEY ON USE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT DATA
PROVIDED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES PROGRAM
OF THE MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

INSTRUCTIONS:

The U.S. General Accounting Office is an agency of the Congress responsible for evaluating Federal programs. We are currently conducting a review of the Outer Continental Shelf Environmental Studies Program which is administered by the Minerals Management Service of the Department of the Interior.

As part of our review we are contacting individuals who have participated in the management of the program as well as a randomly selected sample of people and organizations who have expressed an interest in the Environmental Studies Program since October 1982. Because you are one of only a small number of people we are contacting, your reply to our questionnaire--whether or not you use studies from the program--is of great importance to us.

There is a small possibility that you may receive two requests to complete this questionnaire: one directly from us and one from your employer. If this occurs, please follow the instructions in Question 1.

The questionnaire should take approximately 30-45 minutes to complete. Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope within 5 days of receiving it. Your responses will be combined with those of others and reported in summary form to the U.S. Congress.

If you have any questions, please call Richard Jorgenson, Tom Reilly or Doug Glovier: telephone number (202) 275-8904 or (202) 254-7392.

In the event that the return envelope is misplaced, the return address is:

Mr. Richard Jorgenson
Room 4476
U.S. General Accounting Office
441 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20548

Environmental Studies Program

The Environmental Studies Program (ESP) of the Minerals Management Service (MMS) was designed to provide information for assessment and management of environmental impacts on the human, marine and coastal environments of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) and coastal areas which may be affected by oil and gas development.

Information gathered through the ESP is used by MMS as an information base for OCS leasing and management decisions. It is also used by private industry, academic institutions, other federal or state government agencies, and concerned citizens. Study information is received by MMS from various contractors in many forms such as hard copy reports, data reports, maps, and computer tapes.

The ESP was established in 1973. Until October 1982, it was administered by the Bureau of Land Management. Since October 1982 it has been administered by MMS.

To the extent possible, please answer our questionnaire based on your experiences with the program under MMS's administration of it, October 1982 to the present.

INTRODUCTION

1. Have you received more than one copy of this questionnaire? (Check one.) CD(1) (6)

1. [1] To date this is the only copy I have received.
2. [0] This is the second copy I have received. My answers on this copy are different from my initial response.
3. [1] This is the second copy I have received. My answers on this copy would be the same as my initial response. (Skip to Q39)

2. Which of the following categories best describes your primary personal or organizational affiliation for your dealings with the Environmental Studies Program (ESP)? (Check one.) (7-8)

1. [01] State government
2. [ ] Local government
3. [ ] Oil or natural gas company
4. [ ] Other oil or gas related company
5. [ ] Trade association
6. [ ] Fisheries group
7. [ ] Environmental interest group
8. [ ] University
9. [ ] Private research/consultant
10. [23] Federal government (specify department and agency):
11. [ ] Library/repository (Stop here Please return your questionnaire in the enclosed envelope so that we can properly count you in our statistics.)
12. [ ] Other (specify):

3. Are you completing this questionnaire as an individual or for your organization? (Check one.) (9)

1. [1] As an individual
2. [1] For my organization

4. Approximately how long have you or your organization been involved with the ESP and/or receiving or using its studies? (Enter number of years or fraction of a year.) (10-11)

8.0 Years

5. With approximately how many ESP studies or reports are you or your organization at least somewhat familiar? (Check one.) (12)

1. [ ] None
2. [1] 1 - 5
3. [1] 6 - 10
4. [ ] 11 - 15
5. [ ] 16 - 20
6. [1] More than 20

ACQUISITION OF ESP STUDIES

6. In your opinion, how helpful or unhelpful has MMS been in providing information about ongoing ESP studies? (Check one.) (13)

1. [1] Very helpful
2. [3] Somewhat helpful
3. [ ] Undecided
4. [ ] Somewhat unhelpful
5. [ ] Very unhelpful
6. [ ] No opinion

7. Which of the following methods describes how you or your organization usually learn that a completed ESP study is available? (Check all that apply.)
(14-18)

1. [60] Review MMS quarterly listing of completed offshore publications
2. [28] Hear about study from informal contacts with MMS officials
3. [54] Am on MMS distribution list and receive studies directly
4. [8] Learn about study from other MMS sources (specify):
5. [13] Other (specify):

8. From which of the following sources do you or your organization typically obtain copies of ESP studies or study reports? (Check all that apply.)
(19-23)

1. [85] MMS directly
2. [9] National Technical Information Service
3. [2] Public or private library*
4. [3] Other (specify):*
5. [3] Have not obtained any studies*

* If you checked categories 3, 4 or 5, SKIP TO Q16

9. Are there any ESP studies or study reports that you or your organization have requested which were never delivered? (Check one.)
(24)

1. [3] Yes
2. [81] No (SKIP TO Q11)

10. Which of the following reasons explains why the study (or studies) were not delivered? (Check all that apply.)
(25-29)

1. [2] Study or report was out of print
2. [2] Copies of study were unavailable
3. [0] Request was lost or misplaced
4. [1] Reason not known
5. [0] Other (specify):

11. About how long does it typically take from the time you or your organization request a published study or interim information about a study until you receive it? (Check one.)
(30)

1. [58] A few weeks
2. [12] A month
3. [0] 2 - 3 months
4. [0] 4 - 5 months
5. [1] 6 months or longer

12. In general, about how many separate requests for a published study or interim information about a study do you or your organization make before you receive it? (Check one.)
(31)

1. [88] One
2. [1] Two
3. [1] Three or more

13. How would you characterize the reproduction quality (legibility, completeness) of most study or report copies that you or your organization have received? (Check one.)
(32)

1. [25] Excellent
2. [24] Above Average
3. [50] Average
4. [0] Below Average
5. [0] Poor

14. How often, if at all, have you or your organization received copies of unrequested ESP studies? (Check one.)

(33)

1. [27] Rarely, if ever
2. [34] On occasion
3. [13] Often
4. [5] Very often
5. [2] Extremely often

15. How often, if at all, have you or your organization received more than the requested number of copies of a study? (Check one.)

(34)

1. [60] Rarely, if ever
2. [18] On occasion
3. [9] Often
4. [5] Very often
5. [3] Extremely often

USE AND QUALITY OF ESP STUDIES

MMS originally planned and funded many ESP studies for use in its management of proposed lease sales and post sale activities. We are interested in your experiences with studies that you or your organization planned to use for pre or post sale activities as well as studies that you had no prior intent to use for lease sale activities.

16. To what extent, if at all, did you or your organization intend to use one or more ESP studies to give input to MMS on specific lease sales or post sale management decisions ? (Check one.)

(35)

1. [15] Little or no extent (SKIP TO Q19)
2. [19] Some extent
3. [26] Moderate extent
4. [13] Great extent
5. [10] Very great extent

17. How timely or untimely were those studies you intended to use for input to MMS on proposed lease sales or post sale activities? (Check one.)

(36)

1. [18] Extremely timely (all or almost all received in time to use)
2. [24] Moderately timely (majority received in time to use)
3. [13] Neither timely nor untimely (about half received in time and half received too late to use)
4. [7] Moderately untimely (majority received too late to use)
5. [2] Extremely untimely (all or almost all received too late to use)
6. [2] Have not received any studies

18. To what extent did the time between your request for a study and your receipt of it help or interfere with your ability to use the study? (Check one.)

(37)

1. [16] Greatly helped
2. [12] Somewhat helped
3. [31] Neither helped nor interfered
4. [6] Somewhat interfered
5. [3] Greatly interfered
6. [2] Have not requested any studies

19. In your opinion, about what percent of ESP studies provided information that MMS needed and what percent were not needed by MMS for specific lease sale or post sale management decisions? (Enter one percentage for each category.)

1. 74.1 % Needed by MMS for pre or post lease sale decisionmaking (38-39)
2. 25.7 % Not needed by MMS for pre or post lease sale decisionmaking (40-41)
   (If zero, SKIP TO Q22)

   100 % TOTAL

3. [30] No opinion (SKIP TO Q22) (42)

20. Of those studies which you believe were not needed by MMS for pre or post lease sale decisions (response category 2 in Question 19), about how many were not needed for each of the following reasons? (Check one box for each reason.)

(43-46)

	Few If Any 1	Some 2	About Half 3	Most 4	All or Almost All 5
1. They replicated other studies.	13	19	1	1	1
2. Their data was not critical to MMS decisionmaking.	2	22	6	8	1
3. They had little or no direct application to MMS decision-making.	3	18	8	5	1
4. Other (specify):	0	4	0	3	2

21. Consider again only those studies which you believe were not needed by MMS for pre or post lease sale decisions. How useful, if at all, for each of the following other purposes were these studies? (Check one box for each purpose.)

(47-52)

	Little or No Use 1	Some-what Useful 2	Moder-ately Useful 3	Very Useful 4	Ex-tremely Useful 5	No Opinion 6
1. Establish baseline information	0	15	15	6	6	0
2. Break new scientific ground	16	11	10	2	2	0
3. Add to knowledge base on effects of offshore leasing	3	20	12	4	3	0
4. Reach conclusions about OCS environment	2	19	9	9	1	0
5. Stimulate/perform subsequent research about OCS environment	4	8	20	5	2	1
6. Other (specify):	0	0	0	3	1	0

22. To what extent, if at all, have you or your organization actually used ESP studies for each of the following general purposes? (Check one box for each purpose.)

(53-64)

	Little or No Extent 1	Some Extent 2	Moderate Extent 3	Great Extent 4	Very Great Extent 5
1. Provide input during MMS pre sale planning process (e.g., comment on Environmental Impact Statements)	13	25	18	22	6
2. Provide input during MMS post sale development process (e.g., comment on exploration or production plans)	28	16	20	15	4
3. Comment on MMS 5-year leasing program	13	26	18	23	3
4. Review Coastal Zone Management consistency requirements	38	16	15	11	1
5. Review or test compliance with other federal, state, or local laws	36	17	17	9	1
6. Develop, evaluate or review exploration or production plans	29	12	26	10	5
7. Develop, evaluate or review actual or proposed leasing regulations	26	22	21	9	3
8. Prepare environmental reports for your own or other organizations	28	19	16	13	5
9. Develop OCS-related policy for non-MMS agencies or organizations	40	13	19	8	1
10. Provide a basis for scientific research	31	12	22	13	5
11. Update, assess, or synthesize knowledge in a subject area	16	15	27	18	8
12. Other (specify):	2	1	2	1	2

23. In general, how timely or untimely for the purposes or actual uses you checked in Question 22 have ESP studies been? (Check one.)

(65)

1. [1] Very timely
2. [9] Somewhat timely
3. [20] Neither timely nor untimely
4. [12] Somewhat untimely
5. [1] Very untimely

24. Overall, how useful to you, if at all, have ESP studies been? (Check one.)

(66)

1. [6] Little or no use
2. [25] Somewhat useful
3. [22] Moderately useful
4. [9] Very useful
5. [5] Extremely useful

25. In your opinion, how much, if at all, do each of the following characteristics of ESP studies help or interfere with their usefulness? (Check one box for each characteristic.)

(67-74)

	Greatly Helps 1	Somewhat Helps 2	Neither Helps nor Interferes 3	Somewhat Interferes 4	Greatly Interferes 5	No Opinion 6
1. Timing of the studies	16	30	13	15	3	9
2. Quality of studies	30	29	9	6	1	11
3. Technical nature of studies	22	39	10	3	0	12
4. Topics or issues covered	18	42	8	8	0	9
5. Currentness of information	22	31	12	10	1	10
6. Objectivity of studies	20	33	18	4	0	10
7. Studies' contribution to scientific knowledge	19	44	7	2	1	10
8. Other (specify):	1	3	0	1	2	3

IDZ (1-4)
CD2 (5)

26. Based on your experience, how excellent or poor are ESP studies, in general, with respect to each of the following characteristics? (Check one box for each characteristic.)

(6-17)

	Excellent 1	Above Average 2	Average 3	Below Average 4	Poor 5	No Basis to Judge 6
1. Importance of issues studied	10	35	28	5	1	7
2. Depth of issue treatment	9	32	29	7	0	9
3. Objectivity	12	24	36	5	1	8
4. Reliability of study methods	10	32	27	2	1	14
5. Validity of data gathered	8	32	29	4	0	13
6. Validity of conclusions and recommendations	7	20	40	7	0	10
7. Ability to generalize findings	8	16	44	10	0	8
8. Contribution to knowledge in the field	15	28	26	7	1	9
9. Contribution to future research ideas	12	27	28	10	0	9
10. Form in which results are communicated	7	20	37	12	3	7
11. Integration of results with other impact data	3	12	31	16	8	15
12. Other (specify):	1	1	0	0	2	3

27. In your opinion, how excellent or poor is the overall quality of ESP studies, in general? (Check one.)

(18)

1. [1] Excellent
2. [36] Above average
3. [28] Average
4. [3] Below average
5. [0] Poor

OPINIONS ABOUT ESP STUDY PROGRAM

28. In your opinion, have ESP studies overemphasized, underemphasized or placed an appropriate level of emphasis on each of the following research topics? (Check one box for each topic.)

(19-31)

	Greatly Over-Emphasized	Somewhat Over-Emphasized	Appro-priately Emphasized	Somewhat Under-Emphasized	Greatly Under-Emphasized	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Coastal Habitats	0	7	32	23	13	9
2. Offshore Habitats	1	10	46	16	3	7
3. Endangered and Threatened Species	11	19	36	7	3	8
4. Other Wildlife Species	3	6	44	13	2	16
5. Commercial Fisheries	1	10	35	25	6	7
6. Socioeconomic Conditions	4	14	25	23	7	10
7. Water Quality	1	6	47	15	3	12
8. Air Quality	5	6	41	14	0	18
9. Meteorological Conditions	2	7	51	8	1	15
10. Chemical Oceanography	0	5	54	10	2	12
11. Physical Oceanography	1	11	50	14	0	8
12. Environmental Geology and Hazards	2	4	46	13	6	12
13. Other (specify):	1	0	1	1	7	4

29. In your opinion, to what extent should future ESP studies focus on each of the following research topics? (Check one box for each topic.)

(32-44)

	Little or No Extent	Some Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent	Very Great Extent	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Coastal Habitats	4	6	22	28	16	7
2. Offshore Habitats	1	4	38	23	13	5
3. Endangered and Threatened Species	2	19	27	26	6	4
4. Other Wildlife Species	3	19	38	15	0	9
5. Commercial Fisheries	2	8	24	39	7	4
6. Socioeconomic Conditions	10	15	27	18	7	7
7. Water Quality	1	8	34	32	4	5
8. Air Quality	7	20	34	13	1	9
9. Meteorological Conditions	5	26	26	16	1	9
10. Chemical Oceanography	4	19	31	16	6	8
11. Physical Oceanography	4	16	28	24	6	6
12. Environmental Geology and Hazards	4	14	25	20	14	7
13. Other (specify):	0	0	1	1	10	5

30. Based on your experience, how excellent or poor is the current level of scientific knowledge about each of the following research topics related to oil and gas activities on the Outer Continental Shelf? (Check one box for each topic.)

(45-57)

	Excellent 1	Above Average 2	Average 3	Below Average 4	Poor 5	No Basis to Judge 6
1. Coastal Habitats	6	21	24	18	9	6
2. Offshore Habitats	5	18	25	28	2	6
3. Endangered and Threatened Species	5	36	27	9	3	5
4. Other Wildlife Species	2	21	37	11	3	11
5. Commercial Fisheries	4	18	32	23	4	4
6. Socioeconomic Conditions	4	9	34	20	6	11
7. Water Quality	3	14	38	17	5	6
8. Air Quality	3	9	40	15	2	15
9. Meteorological Conditions	4	14	44	8	1	13
10. Chemical Oceanography	4	17	39	10	3	11
11. Physical Oceanography	4	23	35	12	3	7
12. Environmental Geology and Hazards	4	17	39	13	4	6
13. Other (specify):	0	1	2	3	7	3

31. In your opinion, have ESP studies overemphasized, underemphasized or placed an appropriate level of emphasis on each of the following factors associated with development of oil and gas resources on the Outer Continental Shelf? (Check one box for each factor.)

(58-66)

	Greatly Over-Emphasized 1	Somewhat Over-Emphasized 2	Appro-priately Emphasized 3	Somewhat Under-Emphasized 4	Greatly Under-Emphasized 5	No Opinion 6
1. Air Emissions	4	10	36	15	3	17
2. Noise Emissions	7	11	35	15	1	15
3. Trash and Debris	2	5	31	29	6	11
4. Effluent Discharges	2	10	41	21	4	7
5. Waterway Traffic	0	5	44	17	4	15
6. Construction Activities	1	0	50	16	2	16
7. Operations Activities	0	4	48	17	2	14
8. Demolition Activities	1	1	32	22	10	19
9. Other (specify):	0	0	0	0	3	7

ID3 (1-4)
CD3 (5)

32. In your opinion, to what extent should future ESP studies focus on each of the following factors associated with development of oil and gas resources on the Outer Continental Shelf? (Check one box for each factor.)

(6-14)

	Little or No Extent 1	Some Extent 2	Moderate Extent 3	Great Extent 4	Very Great Extent 5	No Opinion 6
1. Air Emissions	11	27	27	10	2	7
2. Noise Emissions	17	27	26	5	0	9
3. Trash and Debris	4	20	29	24	4	4
4. Effluent Discharges	4	11	25	36	6	3
5. Waterway Traffic	7	20	41	9	1	6
6. Construction Activities	7	17	40	14	1	6
7. Operations Activities	3	12	38	23	3	6
8. Demolition Activities	3	15	36	20	4	7
9. Other (specify):	1	1	0	3	2	3

33. Based on your experience, how excellent or poor is the current level of scientific knowledge about each of the following factors associated with oil and gas activities on the Outer Continental Shelf? (Check one box for each factor.)

(15-23)

	Excellent 1	Above Average 2	Average 3	Below Average 4	Poor 5	No Basis to Judge 6
1. Air Emissions	7	15	31	15	1	16
2. Noise Emissions	7	17	30	11	2	17
3. Trash and Debris	5	16	20	27	6	10
4. Effluent Discharges	7	19	27	20	5	6
5. Waterway Traffic	4	12	46	10	1	12
6. Construction Activities	4	14	41	10	1	13
7. Operations Activities	5	15	39	15	0	11
8. Demolition Activities	2	5	29	29	5	14
9. Other (specify):	0	1	0	1	5	5

PARTICIPATION IN ESP PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

34. Are you now or have you been a member of any of the following MMS (or Bureau of Land Management for periods prior to October 1982) committees? (Check one box for each committee and period of membership that applies.)

	10/82 - Present	1973 - 10/82	Never a Member
OCS Policy Committee	26	9	38 (24-26)
OCS Scientific Advisory Committee	12	10	46 (27-29)
Regional Technical Working Group Committee	55	22	18 (30-32)

35. Are you now or have you been a member of any similar OCS-related committees for agencies or organizations other than MMS? (Check one box for each committee and period of membership that applies.)

	10/82 - Present	1973 - 10/82	Never a Member
OCS policy committee	9	3	54 (33-35)
OCS scientific advisory committee	4	6	57 (36-38)
Technical working group committee	12	7	48 (39-41)

36. How often, if at all, do you or your organization comment on or participate in each of the following activities related to MMS's management of the ESP? (Check one box for each activity.)

(42-46)

	Rarely, if Ever* 1	On Occasion 2	Often 3	Very Often 4	Always or Almost Always 5
Information transfer meetings	9	19	12	5	39
Development of regional studies plans	12	16	17	9	30
Development of national studies list	28	30	9	5	10
Development of program policies	25	26	13	7	12
Other (specify):	2	1	0	0	1

*If you checked rarely, if ever, for all of the above activities, SKIP TO Q38.

37. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the amount and type of feedback or response from MMS on your participation in ESP management? (Check one.)

(47)

1. [6] Greatly satisfied
2. [1] Moderately satisfied
3. [2] Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4. [0] Moderately dissatisfied
5. [0] Greatly dissatisfied

CONCLUSION

38. To what extent are your responses to this survey based on your knowledge of or experiences with the ESP program in each of the following OCS regions? (Check one box for each region.)

(48-51)

	Little or No Extent 1	Some Extent 2	Moderate Extent 3	Great Extent 4	Very Great Extent 5
1. Atlantic	22	14	7	15	24
2. Gulf of Mexico	22	19	10	15	16
3. Pacific	33	20	8	7	10
4. Alaska	34	20	5	8	9

39. Please provide the name, title, and phone number of the person we should contact if we need additional information about your responses to our survey.

Name _____

Title _____

Phone ( ) _____

Area Code Number

40. Comments: Please use the space below and the back of this page to provide any additional comments you may have concerning either the Environmental Studies Program (including suggestions for program improvements) or this survey.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Random Sample Responses to Our Questionnaire

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

SURVEY ON USE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT DATA
PROVIDED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES PROGRAM
OF THE MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

INSTRUCTIONS:

The U.S. General Accounting Office is an agency of the Congress responsible for evaluating Federal programs. We are currently conducting a review of the Outer Continental Shelf Environmental Studies Program which is administered by the Minerals Management Service of the Department of the Interior.

As part of our review we are contacting individuals who have participated in the management of the program as well as a randomly selected sample of people and organizations who have expressed an interest in the Environmental Studies Program since October 1982. Because you are one of only a small number of people we are contacting, your reply to our questionnaire--whether or not you use studies from the program--is of great importance to us.

There is a small possibility that you may receive two requests to complete this questionnaire: one directly from us and one from your employer. If this occurs, please follow the instructions in Question 1.

The questionnaire should take approximately 30-45 minutes to complete. Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope within 5 days of receiving it. Your responses will be combined with those of others and reported in summary form to the U.S. Congress.

If you have any questions, please call Richard Jorgenson, Tom Reilly or Doug Glovier: telephone number (202) 275-8904 or (202) 254-7392.

In the event that the return envelope is misplaced, the return address is:

Mr. Richard Jorgenson
Room 4476
U.S. General Accounting Office
441 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20548

Environmental Studies Program

The Environmental Studies Program (ESP) of the Minerals Management Service (MMS) was designed to provide information for assessment and management of environmental impacts on the human, marine and coastal environments of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) and coastal areas which may be affected by oil and gas development.

Information gathered through the ESP is used by MMS as an information base for OCS leasing and management decisions. It is also used by private industry, academic institutions, other federal or state government agencies, and concerned citizens. Study information is received by MMS from various contractors in many forms such as hard copy reports, data reports, maps, and computer tapes.

The ESP was established in 1973. Until October 1982, it was administered by the Bureau of Land Management. Since October 1982 it has been administered by MMS.

To the extent possible, please answer our questionnaire based on your experiences with the program under MMS's administration of it, October 1982 to the present.

INTRODUCTION

1. Have you received more than one copy of this questionnaire? (Check one.) CD(1) (6)

1. [412] To date this is the only copy I have received.
2. [1] This is the second copy I have received. My answers on this copy are different from my initial response.
3. [14] This is the second copy I have received. My answers on this copy would be the same as my initial response. (Skip to Q39)

2. Which of the following categories best describes your primary personal or organizational affiliation for your dealings with the Environmental Studies Program (ESP)? (Check one.) (7-8)

1. [40] State government
2. [17] Local government
3. [59] Oil or natural gas company
4. [1] Other oil or gas related company
5. [8] Trade association
6. [7] Fisheries group
7. [2] Environmental interest group
8. [83] University
9. [94] Private research/consultant
10. [83] Federal government (specify department and agency):
11. [0] Library/repository (Stop here. Please return your questionnaire in the enclosed envelope so that we can properly count you in our statistics.)
12. [28] Other (specify):

3. Are you completing this questionnaire as an individual or for your organization? (Check one.) (9)

1. [27] As an individual
2. [16] For my organization

4. Approximately how long have you or your organization been involved with the ESP and/or receiving or using its studies? (Enter number of years or fraction of a year.) (10-11)

6.5 Years

5. With approximately how many ESP studies or reports are you or your organization at least somewhat familiar? (Check one.) (12)

1. [28] None
2. [15] 1 - 5
3. [10] 6 - 10
4. [49] 11 - 15
5. [19] 16 - 20
6. [76] More than 20

ACQUISITION OF ESP STUDIES

6. In your opinion, how helpful or unhelpful has MMS been in providing information about ongoing ESP studies? (Check one.) (13)

1. [34] Very helpful
2. [43] Somewhat helpful
3. [60] Undecided
4. [15] Somewhat unhelpful
5. [1] Very unhelpful
6. [41] No opinion

7. Which of the following methods describes how you or your organization usually learn that a completed ESP study is available? (Check all that apply.)
(14-18)

1. [22] Review MMS quarterly listing of completed offshore publications
2. [13] Hear about study from informal contacts with MMS officials
3. [14] Am on MMS distribution list and receive studies directly
4. [18] Learn about study from other MMS sources (specify):
5. [65] Other (specify):

8. From which of the following sources do you or your organization typically obtain copies of ESP studies or study reports? (Check all that apply.)
(19-23)

1. [51] MMS directly
2. [31] National Technical Information Service
3. [52] Public or private library*
4. [29] Other (specify):*
5. [40] Have not obtained any studies*

* If you checked categories 3, 4 or 5, SKIP TO Q16

9. Are there any ESP studies or study reports that you or your organization have requested which were never delivered? (Check one.)
(24)

1. [07] Yes
2. [04] No (SKIP TO Q11)

10. Which of the following reasons explains why the study (or studies) were not delivered? (Check all that apply.)
(25-29)

1. [21] Study or report was out of print
2. [23] Copies of study were unavailable
3. [1] Request was lost or misplaced
4. [9] Reason not known
5. [1] Other (specify):

11. About how long does it typically take from the time you or your organization request a published study or interim information about a study until you receive it? (Check one.)
(30)

1. [23] A few weeks
2. [52] A month
3. [16] 2 - 3 months
4. [1] 4 - 5 months
5. [1] 6 months or longer

12. In general, about how many separate requests for a published study or interim information about a study do you or your organization make before you receive it? (Check one.)
(31)

1. [62] One
2. [33] Two
3. [3] Three or more

13. How would you characterize the reproduction quality (legibility, completeness) of most study or report copies that you or your organization have received? (Check one.)
(32)

1. [9] Excellent
2. [36] Above Average
3. [11] Average
4. [4] Below Average
5. [1] Poor

14. How often, if at all, have you or your organization received copies of unrequested ESP studies? (Check one.) (33)

1. [21] Rarely, if ever
2. [18] On occasion
3. [52] Often
4. [3] Very often
5. [3] Extremely often

15. How often, if at all, have you or your organization received more than the requested number of copies of a study? (Check one.) (34)

1. [51] Rarely, if ever
2. [47] On occasion
3. [5] Often
4. [1] Very often
5. [1] Extremely often

USE AND QUALITY OF ESP STUDIES

MMS originally planned and funded many ESP studies for use in its management of proposed lease sales and post sale activities. We are interested in your experiences with studies that you or your organization planned to use for pre or post sale activities as well as studies that you had no prior intent to use for lease sale activities.

16. To what extent, if at all, did you or your organization intend to use one or more ESP studies to give input to MMS on specific lease sales or post sale management decisions ? (Check one.) (35)

1. [24] Little or no extent (SKIP TO Q19)
2. [72] Some extent
3. [56] Moderate extent
4. [44] Great extent
5. [37] Very great extent

17. How timely or untimely were those studies you intended to use for input to MMS on proposed lease sales or post sale activities? (Check one.) (36)

1. [38] Extremely timely (all or almost all received in time to use)
2. [96] Moderately timely (majority received in time to use)
3. [38] Neither timely nor untimely (about half received in time and half received too late to use)
4. [13] Moderately untimely (majority received too late to use)
5. [1] Extremely untime (all or most all receive too late to use)
6. [9] Have not received any studies

18. To what extent did the time between your request for a study and your receipt of it help or interfere with your ability to use the study? (Check one.) (37)

1. [64] Greatly helped
2. [62] Somewhat helped
3. [69] Neither helped nor interfered
4. [13] Somewhat interfered
5. [3] Greatly interfered
6. [1] Have not requested any studies

19. In your opinion, about what percent of ESP studies provided information that MMS needed and what percent were not needed by MMS for specific lease sale or post sale management decisions? (Enter one percentage for each category.)

1. 69 % Needed by MMS for pre or post lease sale decisionmaking (38-39)
2. 30 % Not needed by MMS for pre or post lease sale decisionmaking (40-41)
   (If zero, SKIP TO Q22)

100 % TOTAL

3. [289] No opinion (SKIP TO Q22) (42)

20. Of those studies which you believe were not needed by MMS for pre or post lease sale decisions (response category 2 in Question 19), about how many were not needed for each of the following reasons? (Check one box for each reason.)

(43-46)

	Few If Any 1	Some 2	About Half 3	Most 4	All or Almost All 5
1. They replicated other studies.	27	64	12	12	5
2. Their data was not critical to MMS decisionmaking.	10	52	30	25	7
3. They had little or no direct application to MMS decision-making.	19	48	22	27	8
4. Other (specify):	3	5	5	4	1

21. Consider again only those studies which you believe were not needed by MMS for pre or post lease sale decisions. How useful, if at all, for each of the following other purposes were these studies? (Check one box for each purpose.)

(47-52)

	Little or No Use 1	Somewhat Useful 2	Moderately Useful 3	Very Useful 4	Extremely Useful 5	No Opinion 6
1. Establish baseline information	8	36	44	26	15	3
2. Break new scientific ground	37	31	37	9	8	4
3. Add to knowledge base on effects of offshore leasing	16	39	34	27	7	4
4. Reach conclusions about OCS environment	15	42	32	29	9	4
5. Stimulate/perform subsequent research about OCS environment	17	34	32	23	8	10
6. Other (specify):	2	1	1	2	2	1

22. To what extent, if at all, have you or your organization actually used ESP studies for each of the following general purposes? (Check one box for each purpose.)

(53-64)

	Little or No Extent 1	Some Extent 2	Moderate Extent 3	Great Extent 4	Very Great Extent 5
1. Provide input during MMS pre sale planning process (e.g., comment on Environmental Impact Statements)	223	71	44	34	8
2. Provide input during MMS post sale development process (e.g., comment on exploration or production plans)	247	59	36	23	11
3. Comment on MMS 5-year leasing program	241	62	43	17	11
4. Review Coastal Zone Management consistency requirements	219	75	56	17	11
5. Review or test compliance with other federal, state, or local laws	234	60	50	19	12
6. Develop, evaluate or review exploration or production plans	223	59	48	29	14
7. Develop, evaluate or review actual or proposed leasing regulations	245	55	40	24	9
8. Prepare environmental reports for your own or other organizations	132	75	93	64	33
9. Develop OCS-related policy for non-MMS agencies or organizations	245	51	43	18	13
10. Provide a basis for scientific research	124	77	105	65	37
11. Update, assess, or synthesize knowledge in a subject area	63	69	131	96	48
12. Other (specify):	22	8	9	9	5

23. In general, how timely or untimely for the purposes or actual uses you checked in Question 22 have ESP studies been? (Check one.)

(65)

1. [0] Very timely
2. [7] Somewhat timely
3. [18] Neither timely nor untimely
4. [3] Somewhat untimely
5. [2] Very untimely

24. Overall, how useful to you, if at all, have ESP studies been? (Check one.)

(66)

1. [3] Little or no use
2. [3] Somewhat useful
3. [18] Moderately useful
4. [20] Very useful
5. [2] Extremely useful

25. In your opinion, how much, if at all, do each of the following characteristics of ESP studies help or interfere with their usefulness? (Check one box for each characteristic.)

(67-74)

	Greatly Helps 1	Somewhat Helps 2	Neither Helps nor Interferes 3	Somewhat Interferes 4	Greatly Interferes 5	No Opinion 6
1. Timing of the studies	66	145	84	29	5	89
2. Quality of studies	113	161	69	16	4	58
3. Technical nature of studies	121	148	72	18	1	62
4. Topics or issues covered	113	174	55	17	2	60
5. Currentness of information	107	164	60	19	4	65
6. Objectivity of studies	102	134	83	22	8	73
7. Studies' contribution to scientific knowledge	115	156	59	12	6	68
8. Other (specify):	6	2	1	2	7	41

IDZ (1-6)
CD2 (5)

26. Based on your experience, how excellent or poor are ESP studies, in general, with respect to each of the following characteristics? (Check one box for each characteristic.)

(6-17)

	Excellent 1	Above Average 2	Average 3	Below Average 4	Poor 5	No Basis to Judge 6
1. Importance of issues studied	48	172	122	10	2	68
2. Depth of issue treatment	29	145	148	29	7	64
3. Objectivity	33	115	165	24	11	73
4. Reliability of study methods	31	129	154	20	8	78
5. Validity of data gathered	36	108	169	15	6	85
6. Validity of conclusions and recommendations	24	93	183	32	9	82
7. Ability to generalize findings	20	100	170	48	9	75
8. Contribution to knowledge in the field	45	147	135	26	8	57
9. Contribution to future research ideas	58	104	145	32	8	74
10. Form in which results are communicated	28	113	165	41	14	60
11. Integration of results with other impact data	17	79	140	65	25	91
12. Other (specify):	2	1	6	1	5	33

27. In your opinion, how excellent or poor is the overall quality of ESP studies, in general? (Check one.)

(18)

1. 39 Excellent
2. 190 Above average
3. 150 Average
4. [16] Below average
5. [1] Poor

OPINIONS ABOUT ESP STUDY PROGRAM

28. In your opinion, have ESP studies overemphasized, underemphasized or placed an appropriate level of emphasis on each of the following research topics? (Check one box for each topic.)

(19-31)

	Greatly Over-Emphasized	Somewhat Over-Emphasized	Appro-priately Emphasized	Somewhat Under-Emphasized	Greatly Under-Emphasized	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Coastal Habitats	7	30	157	81	27	116
2. Offshore Habitats	7	43	211	37	10	110
3. Endangered and Threatened Species	18	63	141	53	17	126
4. Other Wildlife Species	1	28	148	84	15	142
5. Commercial Fisheries	2	25	137	87	20	141
6. Socioeconomic Conditions	14	46	113	69	24	147
7. Water Quality	4	22	157	67	15	152
8. Air Quality	6	25	127	64	14	182
9. Meteorological Conditions	1	20	167	47	9	171
10. Chemical Oceanography	2	28	157	48	8	173
11. Physical Oceanography	5	43	173	42	8	146
12. Environmental Geology and Hazards	3	28	164	57	17	148
13. Other (specify):	0	0	5	7	19	50

29. In your opinion, to what extent should future ESP studies focus on each of the following research topics? (Check one box for each topic.)

(32-44)

	Little or No Extent	Some Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent	Very Great Extent	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Coastal Habitats	2	41	103	124	79	72
2. Offshore Habitats	6	42	131	125	47	71
3. Endangered and Threatened Species	8	52	138	96	54	74
4. Other Wildlife Species	6	65	143	77	34	93
5. Commercial Fisheries	4	45	123	122	47	81
6. Socioeconomic Conditions	23	76	118	71	38	95
7. Water Quality	4	40	137	106	54	83
8. Air Quality	12	62	128	70	46	104
9. Meteorological Conditions	13	79	132	62	25	110
10. Chemical Oceanography	7	76	122	78	24	115
11. Physical Oceanography	8	62	115	96	42	100
12. Environmental Geology and Hazards	7	54	114	104	47	95
13. Other (specify):	2	0	10	11	17	34

30. Based on your experience, how excellent or poor is the current level of scientific knowledge about each of the following research topics related to oil and gas activities on the Outer Continental Shelf? (Check one box for each topic.)

(45-57)

	Excellent 1	Above Average 2	Average 3	Below Average 4	Poor 5	No Basis to Judge 6
1. Coastal Habitats	10	92	127	72	26	93
2. Offshore Habitats	10	68	131	94	28	89
3. Endangered and Threatened Species	13	83	114	78	33	101
4. Other Wildlife Species	5	58	139	77	22	119
5. Commercial Fisheries	11	63	123	83	27	113
6. Socioeconomic Conditions	14	66	114	67	28	131
7. Water Quality	8	53	135	85	15	122
8. Air Quality	9	55	120	65	14	156
9. Meteorological Conditions	6	66	144	56	7	141
10. Chemical Oceanography	3	50	150	47	16	154
11. Physical Oceanography	10	85	123	59	13	130
12. Environmental Geology and Hazards	8	75	125	58	21	132
13. Other (specify):	0	4	6	11	17	41

31. In your opinion, have ESP studies overemphasized, underemphasized or placed an appropriate level of emphasis on each of the following factors associated with development of oil and gas resources on the Outer Continental Shelf? (Check one box for each factor.)

(58-66)

	Greatly Over-Emphasized 1	Somewhat Over-Emphasized 2	Appropriately Emphasized 3	Somewhat Under-Emphasized 4	Greatly Under-Emphasized 5	No Opinion 6
1. Air Emissions	12	31	101	61	15	197
2. Noise Emissions	7	31	108	43	13	215
3. Trash and Debris	7	12	107	83	36	174
4. Effluent Discharges	4	29	133	73	31	150
5. Waterway Traffic	0	21	127	60	21	187
6. Construction Activities	2	20	157	50	15	174
7. Operations Activities	3	22	167	47	14	165
8. Demolition Activities	4	23	88	68	36	157
9. Other (specify):	2	1	2	4	10	65

ID3 (1-4)
CD3 (5)

32. In your opinion, to what extent should future ESP studies focus on each of the following factors associated with development of oil and gas resources on the Outer Continental Shelf? (Check one box for each factor.)

(6-14)

	Little or No Extent 1	Some Extent 2	Moderate Extent 3	Great Extent 4	Very Great Extent 5	No Opinion 6
1. Air Emissions	24	68	127	56	25	125
2. Noise Emissions	55	92	108	25	11	132
3. Trash and Debris	7	54	118	98	41	106
4. Effluent Discharges	3	34	97	131	62	97
5. Waterway Traffic	12	64	136	73	14	124
6. Construction Activities	9	64	135	77	24	117
7. Operations Activities	5	51	128	97	23	118
8. Demolition Activities	4	54	120	79	33	132
9. Other (specify):	0	1	8	2	14	48

33. Based on your experience, how excellent or poor is the current level of scientific knowledge about each of the following factors associated with oil and gas activities on the Outer Continental Shelf? (Check one box for each factor.)

(15-23)

	Excellent 1	Above Average 2	Average 3	Below Average 4	Poor 5	No Basis to Judge 6
1. Air Emissions	10	48	103	73	15	177
2. Noise Emissions	11	45	107	58	17	187
3. Trash and Debris	6	45	85	101	39	148
4. Effluent Discharges	4	62	92	91	36	135
5. Waterway Traffic	7	49	130	51	16	171
6. Construction Activities	2	61	133	44	16	169
7. Operations Activities	7	62	135	44	14	163
8. Demolition Activities	4	29	98	62	32	179
9. Other (specify):	1	0	3	2	9	56

PARTICIPATION IN ESP PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

34. Are you now or have you been a member of any of the following MMS (or Bureau of Land Management for periods prior to October 1982) committees? (Check one box for each committee and period of membership that applies.)

	10/82 - Present	1973 - 10/82	Never a Member
OCS Policy Committee	2	1	392 (24-26)
OCS Scientific Advisory Committee	1	13	384 (27-29)
Regional Technical Working Group Committee	9	21	370 (30-32)

35. Are you now or have you been a member of any similar OCS-related committees for agencies or organizations other than MMS? (Check one box for each committee and period of membership that applies.)

	10/82 - Present	1973 - 10/82	Never a Member
OCS policy committee	9	9	369 (33-35)
OCS scientific advisory committee	26	22	355 (36-38)
Technical working group committee	46	32	327 (39-41)

36. How often, if at all, do you or your organization comment on or participate in each of the following activities related to MMS's management of the ESP? (Check one box for each activity.)

(42-46)

	Rarely, if Ever* 1	On Occasion 2	Often 3	Very Often 4	Always or Almost Always 5
Information transfer meetings	158	125	63	30	52
Development of regional studies plans	268	93	28	14	15
Development of national studies list	343	41	13	12	8
Development of program policies	329	52	18	8	9
Other (specify):	50	5	3	3	2

*If you checked rarely, if ever, for all of the above activities, SKIP TO Q38.

37. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the amount and type of feedback or response from MMS on your participation in ESP management? (Check one.)

(47)

1. [1] Greatly satisfied
2. [1] Moderately satisfied
3. [9] Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4. [6] Moderately dissatisfied
5. [2] Greatly dissatisfied

CONCLUSION

38. To what extent are your responses to this survey based on your knowledge of or experiences with the ESP program in each of the following OCS regions? (Check one box for each region.)

(48-51)

	Little or No Extent 1	Some Extent 2	Moderate Extent 3	Great Extent 4	Very Great Extent 5
1. Atlantic	235	78	34	23	20
2. Gulf of Mexico	135	75	45	71	76
3. Pacific	216	68	45	46	22
4. Alaska	188	62	47	37	67

39. Please provide the name, title, and phone number of the person we should contact if we need additional information about your responses to our survey.

Name _____

Title _____

Phone ( ) _____

Area Code Number

40. Comments: Please use the space below and the back of this page to provide any additional comments you may have concerning either the Environmental Studies Program (including suggestions for program improvements) or this survey.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Major Contributors to This Report

Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division, Washington, D.C.	James Duffus III, Associate Director, (202) 275-7756 Robert W. Wilson, Group Director Rosellen McCarthy, Assignment Manager Carolyn Boyce, Social Science Analyst Loren Setlow, Geologist Mark Little, Evaluator Jane Hunt, Reports Analyst Elizabeth Morrison, Writer-Editor Betty Smith, Typist
Washington Regional Office Washington, D.C.	Richard Dasher, Regional Management Representative Richard Jorgenson, Evaluator-in-Charge Thomas Reilly, Evaluator Douglas Glovier, Evaluator
Seattle Regional Office Seattle, Washington	Larry Feltz, Regional Management Representative Robert Bresky, Evaluator Brent Hutchison, Evaluator

U.S. G.P.O. 1988-201-049:80141

Requests for copies of GAO reports should be sent to:

U.S. General Accounting Office
Post Office Box 6015
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20877

Telephone 202-275-6241

The first five copies of each report are free. Additional copies are $2.00 each.

There is a 25% discount on orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a single address.

Orders must be prepaid by cash or by check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents.